Rate-Distortion Theory of Finite Point Processes

Günther Koliander, Dominic Schuhmacher, and Franz Hlawatsch, *Fellow, IEEE*

arXiv:1704.05758v1 [cs.IT] 19 Apr 2017

Abstract

We study the compression of data in the case where the useful information is contained in a set rather than a vector, i.e., the ordering of the data points is irrelevant and the number of data points is unknown. Our analysis is based on rate-distortion theory and the theory of finite point processes. We introduce fundamental information-theoretic concepts and quantities for point processes and present general lower and upper bounds on the rate-distortion function. To enable a comparison with the vector setting, we concretize our bounds for point processes of fixed cardinality. In particular, we analyze a fixed number of unordered data points with a Gaussian distribution and show that we can significantly reduce the required rates compared to the best possible compression strategy for Gaussian vectors. As an example of point processes with variable cardinality, we study the best possible compression of Poisson point processes. For the specific case of a Poisson point process with uniform intensity on the unit square, our lower and upper bounds are separated only by a small gap and thus provide a good characterization of the rate-distortion function.

Index Terms

Source coding, data compression, point process, rate-distortion theory, Shannon lower bound.

I. Introduction

A. Motivation

The continuing growth of the amount of data to be stored and analyzed in many applications calls for efficient methods for representing and compressing large data records [1]. In the literature on data

G. Koliander and F. Hlawatsch are with the Institute of Telecommunications, TU Wien, 1040 Vienna, Austria (e-mail: guenther.koliander@nt.tuwien.ac.at, franz.hlawatsch@nt.tuwien.ac.at).

D. Schuhmacher is with the Institute of Mathematical Stochastics, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, 37077 Göttingen, Germany (e-mail: dominic.schuhmacher@mathematik.uni-goettingen.de).

This work was supported by the FWF under grant P27370-N30.

This work has been submitted to the IEEE for possible publication. Copyright may be transferred without notice, after which this version may no longer be accessible.

compression, one seemingly trivial aspect was hardly considered: the fact that we are often interested in *sets* and not in ordered lists, i.e., vectors, of data points. This can be illustrated by the example of a database containing customer profiles. Although we can sort the database, e.g., alphabetically, there is no "natural" ordering. That we indeed want to consider (unordered) sets and not vectors becomes apparent if we have to compare two databases. Here, a distance between vector versions of the databases would obviously be a bad measure of dissimilarity. Instead, we would first try to find the same customer in both databases and compare the associated entries. This corresponds to an optimal assignment comparison of sets, because the task of finding the same customer is a search for the most similar entries in both databases. Even more obvious is the fact that a different number of customers in the two databases would make a comparison of ordered lists (vectors) impossible.

Our goal in this paper is to study the optimal compression of *finite sets*, also called *point patterns*, in an information-theoretic framework. More specifically, we consider a memoryless source generating a sequence of independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) point patterns, and we want to calculate the minimal rate—i.e., number of representation bits per point pattern—for a given upper bound on the expected distortion. For this information-theoretic analysis, we need distributions on point patterns. Fortunately, these and other relevant mathematical tools are provided by the well-established theory of (finite) point processes (PPs) [2], [3].

B. Prior Work

Information-theoretic work on PPs is scarce. An extension of entropy to PPs is available [3, Sec. 14.8], but to the best of our knowledge the mutual information between PPs was never analyzed in detail (although it is defined by the general quantization-based definition of mutual information [4, eq. (8.54)] or its equivalent form (21)). A similar quantity was recently considered for a special case in [5, Th. VI.1]. However, that quantity is not a natural generalization of mutual information to PPs, because the joint distribution considered in [5, eq. (5)] implies a fixed association between the points in the two PPs involved. Source coding results for PPs are available almost exclusively for (infinite) Poisson PPs on $\mathbb{R}$ [6]–[9]. However, that setting considers only a single PP rather than an i.i.d. sequence of PPs. More specifically, the sequence considered for rate-distortion (RD) analysis in [6]–[9] is the growing vector of the smallest n points of the PP. This approach was also adopted in [10], where the motivation was similar to that of the present paper but the main objective was to study the asymptotic behavior of the RD function as the cardinality of the data set grows infinite. It was shown in [10] that the expected distortion divided by the number of points in the data set converges to zero even for zero-rate coding. Although we are interested in the nonasymptotic scenario, the motivation given in [10] and the fact that

the per-element distortion increases significantly less fast than in the vector case are of relevance to our work.

A different approach to considering point patterns in a source coding setting was presented in [11]. There, the goal was not to reconstruct the points, but to find a covering (consisting of intervals) of all points. There is a tradeoff between the description length of the covering set and its Lebesgue measure, both of which are desired to be as small as possible.

To the best of our knowledge, the RD function for i.i.d. sequences of PPs has not been studied previously. In full generality, such a study requires the definition of a distortion function between sets of possibly different cardinality. A pertinent and convenient definition of a distortion function between point patterns was proposed in [12] in the context of target tracking.

C. Contribution and Paper Organization

In this paper, we are interested in lossy compression of i.i.d. sequences of PPs of possibly varying cardinality. We analyze the benefits that a set-theoretic viewpoint provides over a vector setting and obtain bounds on the RD function in a very general setting. Our results and methods are based on the measure-theoretic fundamentals of RD theory [13].

As the information-theoretic analysis of PPs is not well established, we present expressions of the mutual information between dependent PPs, which can be used in upper bounds on the RD function. Our main contribution is the establishment of upper and lower bounds on the RD function of finite PPs on $\mathbb{R}^d$. The upper bounds are based either on the RD theorem for memoryless sources [13] or on codebooks constructed by a variant of the Linde-Buzo-Gray algorithm [14]. The lower bounds are based on the characterization of mutual information as a supremum [15], which is closely related to the Shannon lower bound [16, eq. (4.8.8)]. To illustrate our results, we compare the setting of a PP of fixed cardinality with that of a vector of the same dimension and find that the RD function in the PP setting is significantly lower. Furthermore, we concretize our bounds for Poisson PPs and, in particular, consider a Poisson PP on the unit square in $\mathbb{R}^2$, for which our bounds convey an accurate characterization of the RD function.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we present fundamental results and definitions from PP theory. In particular, we introduce pairs of dependent PPs, which are relevant to an information-theoretic analysis but not common in the statistical literature. In Section III, the mutual information between PPs is studied in detail. Section IV summarizes some tools from measure-theoretic RD theory that can be used in the analysis of PPs. In Sections V and VI, we present lower and upper bounds on the RD function of PPs in a very general setting. These bounds are applied to PPs of fixed cardinality in Section VII and

to Poisson PPs in Section VIII. In Section IX, we summarize our results and suggest future research directions.

D. Notation

Boldface lowercase letters denote vectors. A vector $\boldsymbol{x} = (\boldsymbol{x}_1^{\mathrm{T}} \cdots \boldsymbol{x}_k^{\mathrm{T}})^{\mathrm{T}} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ with $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ will often be denoted as $(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_k)$ or, more compactly, as $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}$. Sets are denoted by capital letters (e.g., A). The set $A + \boldsymbol{x}$ is the set of all vectors in A shifted by $\boldsymbol{x}$, i.e., $A + \boldsymbol{x} = \{\boldsymbol{y} + \boldsymbol{x} : \boldsymbol{y} \in A\}$. The complement of a set A is denoted as A^c, and the cardinality as $|A|$. The indicator function $\mathbb{1}_A$ is given by $\mathbb{1}_A(x) = 1$ if $x \in A$ and $\mathbb{1}_A(x) = 0$ if $x \notin A$. For sets A_i, $i = 1, \ldots, k$, the Cartesian product is denoted as $\prod_{i=1}^k A_i = A_1 \times A_2 \times \cdots \times A_k$. Sets of sets are denoted by calligraphic letters (e.g., $\mathcal{A}$). Multisets, i.e., sets with not necessarily distinct elements, are denoted in the same way as sets. However, we will use the first letters in the alphabet (A, B, C) to denote sets and the last letters (X, Y, Z) to denote multisets. For a set A and a multiset X, we denote by $X \cap A$ the multiset $\{x \in X : x \in A\}$, which conforms to the classical intersection if X is a set but contains $x \in A$ more than once if X contains more than one copy of x. The set of positive integers $\{1, 2, \ldots\}$ is denoted as $\mathbb{N}$ and the set of nonnegative integers $\{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}$ as $\mathbb{N}_0$. The set of positive real numbers is denoted as $\mathbb{R}^+$ and the set of nonnegative real numbers as $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. Sans serif letters denote random quantities, e.g., x is a random vector and X is a random multiset (or PP). We write $\mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{x}}[\cdot]$ for the expectation operator with respect to the random variable x and simply $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ for the expectation operator with respect to all random variables in the argument. $\Pr[\mathsf{x} \in A]$ denotes the probability that $\mathsf{x} \in A$. $\mathscr{L}^d$ denotes the d-dimensional Lebesgue measure and $\mathcal{B}_d$ denotes the Borel σ-algebra on $\mathbb{R}^d$. For measures μ, ν on the same measurable space, we denote by $\mu \ll \nu$ that μ is absolutely continuous with respect to ν, i.e., that $\nu(A) = 0$ implies $\mu(A) = 0$ for any measurable set A. A random vector x on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is understood to be measurable with respect to $\mathcal{B}_d$. The differential entropy of a continuous random vector x with probability density function g is denoted as $h(\mathsf{x})$ or as $h(g)$, and the entropy of a discrete random variable x is denoted as $H(\mathsf{x})$. The logarithm to the base e is denoted $\log$. For a function $f\colon A \to B$ and a set $C \subseteq B$, $f^{-1}(C)$ denotes the inverse image, i.e., $f^{-1}(C) = \{x \in A : f(x) \in C\}$. In certain equations, we reference an equation number on top of the equality sign in order to indicate that the equality holds due to some previous equation: e.g., $\overset{(42)}{=}$ indicates that the equality holds due to eq. (42).

II. Point Processes as Random Sets of Vectors

In this section, we present basic definitions and results from PP theory. In the classical literature on this subject, PPs are defined as random counting measures [3, Def. 9.1.VI]. Although this approach is very

general and mathematically elegant, we will use a more applied viewpoint and interpret PPs as random multisets, i.e., collections of a random number of random vectors that are not necessarily distinct. These multisets are assumed to be finite in the sense that they have a finite cardinality with probability one.

Definition 1: A *point pattern* X on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is defined as a finite multiset $X \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, i.e., $|X| < \infty$. The collection of all point patterns X on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is denoted as $\mathcal{X}$.

Our goal is to compress point patterns under certain constraints limiting an expected distortion. To this end, we have to define random elements X on $\mathcal{X}$ and, in turn, a σ-algebra.

Definition 2: We denote by $\mathfrak{S}$ the σ-algebra on $\mathcal{X}$ generated by the collections of multisets $\mathcal{X}_k(B) \triangleq \{X \in \mathcal{X} : |X \cap B| = k\}$ for all $B \in \mathcal{B}_d$ and $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$.

A. Finite Point Processes

The random variables[1] X on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{S})$ are called *finite (spatial) PPs on* $\mathbb{R}^d$. Following [2, Sec. 5.3], a finite PP X can be constructed by three steps:

1) Let $|\mathsf{X}|$ be a discrete random variable on $\mathbb{N}_0$ with probability mass function $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}$, i.e., $p_{|\mathsf{X}|} \colon \mathbb{N}_0 \to [0,1]$ with $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) = 1$.
2) For each $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ be a random vector on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ with probability measure $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ and the following symmetry property: $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_k)$ with $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has the same distribution as $(\mathbf{x}_{\tau(1)}, \ldots, \mathbf{x}_{\tau(k)})$ for any permutation τ on $\{1, \ldots, k\}$.
3) The random variable X is defined by first choosing a realization k of the random cardinality $|\mathsf{X}|$ according to $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}$. Then, for $|\mathsf{X}| = k \neq 0$, a realization $(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_k)$ of $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ is chosen according to $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$, and the outcome of $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ is converted to a point pattern via the mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_k \colon (\mathbb{R}^d)^k &\to \mathcal{X} \\ (\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_k) &\mapsto \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_k\}. \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

For $|\mathsf{X}| = 0$, we set $\mathsf{X} = \emptyset$. More compactly, this procedure corresponds to constructing X as

$$\mathsf{X} = \begin{cases} \emptyset & \text{if } |\mathsf{X}| = 0 \\ \phi_k\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big) & \text{if } |\mathsf{X}| = k. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

The probability measure on $(\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{S})$ induced by X is denoted as P_{X} and satisfies

$$P_{\mathsf{X}}(\mathcal{A}) = \Pr[\mathsf{X} \in \mathcal{A}] = p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(\emptyset) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big(\phi_k^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\big) \tag{3}$$

[1]More specifically, X is a random variable $\mathsf{X} \colon (\Omega, \mathfrak{S}_\Omega, \mu) \to (\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{S})$ for some probability space $(\Omega, \mathfrak{S}_\Omega, \mu)$.

for any $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{S}$. It can be shown that the construction above indeed results in a measurable X [3, Ch. 9]. According to (3), an integral with respect to P_{X} (or, equivalently, an expectation with respect to X) can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}} g(X)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}(X) &= \mathbb{E}[g(\mathsf{X})] \\ &= p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)g(\emptyset) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\,\mathbb{E}\big[g\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)})\big)\big] \\ &= p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)g(\emptyset) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} g(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}))\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

for any integrable function $g\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$. This expression can be shown by the standard measure-theoretic approach of defining an integral in turn for indicator functions, simple functions, nonnegative measurable functions, and finally all integrable functions [2, Sec. A1.4]. In particular, by (4) with $g(X) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(X)\widetilde{g}(X)$, we obtain

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}} \widetilde{g}(X)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}(X) = p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}(\emptyset)\widetilde{g}(\emptyset) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \int_{\phi_k^{-1}(\mathcal{A})} \widetilde{g}(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}))\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \tag{5}$$

for any measurable set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ (i.e., $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{S}$).

B. Pairs of Point Processes

For information-theoretic considerations, it is convenient to have a simple definition of the joint distribution of two PPs. Thus, similar to the construction of X, we define a pair of (generally dependent) PPs (X, Y) on the product space $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}$ as follows.

1) Let $(|\mathsf{X}|, |\mathsf{Y}|)$ be a discrete random variable on $\mathbb{N}_0 \times \mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N}_0^2$ with probability mass function $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}$, i.e., $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}\colon \mathbb{N}_0^2 \to [0,1]$ with $\sum_{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})\in\mathbb{N}_0^2} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) = 1$.
2) For each $(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ be a random vector on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}+k_{\mathsf{Y}}}$ with probability measure $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ and the following symmetry property: $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}})$ with $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has the same distribution as $(\mathbf{x}_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}}(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}}(k_{\mathsf{X}})}, \mathbf{y}_{\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})})$ for any permutations τ_{X} on $\{1, \dots, k_{\mathsf{X}}\}$ and τ_{Y} on $\{1, \dots, k_{\mathsf{Y}}\}$. For $k_{\mathsf{X}} = 0$ and $k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}$, let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ be a random vector on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}$ with probability measure $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ and the following symmetry property: $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})} = (\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}})$ with $\mathbf{y}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has the same distribution as $(\mathbf{y}_{\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{y}_{\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})})$ for any permutation τ_{Y} on $\{1, \dots, k_{\mathsf{Y}}\}$. Similarly, for $k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k_{\mathsf{Y}} = 0$, let $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}$ be a random vector on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}}$ with probability measure $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}$ and the following symmetry property: $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)} = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}})$ with $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ has the same distribution as $(\mathbf{x}_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}}(1)}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}}(k_{\mathsf{X}})})$ for any permutation τ_{X} on $\{1, \dots, k_{\mathsf{X}}\}$.
3) The random variable (X, Y) is defined by first choosing a realization $(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}})$ of the random cardinalities $(|\mathsf{X}|, |\mathsf{Y}|)$ according to $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}$. Then, for $(|\mathsf{X}|, |\mathsf{Y}|) = (k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}})$ with $k_{\mathsf{X}} \neq 0$ or $k_{\mathsf{Y}} \neq 0$, a

realization $(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_\mathsf{X}}, \boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_\mathsf{Y}})$ of $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ is chosen according to $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$, and the outcome of $(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ is converted to a pair of point patterns via the mapping

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}} \colon (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}} \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{Y}} &\to \mathcal{X}^2 \\ (\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_\mathsf{X}}, \boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}) &\mapsto \big(\{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_\mathsf{X}}\}, \{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}\}\big) \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

if $(k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y}) \in \mathbb{N}^2$, or

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{0,k_\mathsf{Y}} \colon (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{Y}} &\to \mathcal{X}^2 \\ (\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}) &\mapsto \big(\emptyset, \{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}\}\big) \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

if $k_\mathsf{X} = 0$ and $k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N}$, or

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{k_\mathsf{X},0} \colon (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}} &\to \mathcal{X}^2 \\ (\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_\mathsf{X}}) &\mapsto \big(\{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_\mathsf{X}}\}, \emptyset\big) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

if $k_\mathsf{X} \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k_\mathsf{Y} = 0$. For $(k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y}) = (0, 0)$, we set $(\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}) = (\emptyset, \emptyset)$. More compactly, the overall procedure corresponds to constructing (X, Y) as

$$(\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}) = \begin{cases} (\emptyset, \emptyset) & \text{if } (|\mathsf{X}|, |\mathsf{Y}|) = (0, 0) \\ \phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}\big((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big) & \text{if } (|\mathsf{X}|, |\mathsf{Y}|) = (k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq (0, 0)\,. \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

As we will often use inverse images of the mapping $\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}$ in our proofs, we state some properties of $\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})$ for $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^2$ in Appendix A.

The probability measure on $(\mathcal{X}^2, \mathfrak{S} \otimes \mathfrak{S})$ induced by (X, Y) will be denoted as $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ and satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}) &= \Pr[(\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y}) \in \mathcal{A}] \\ &= p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0) \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\emptyset, \emptyset)\big) + \sum_{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y}) P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\big) \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

for any measurable $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^2$ (i.e., $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{S} \otimes \mathfrak{S}$). An integral with respect to $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ (or, equivalently, an expectation with respect to (X, Y)) can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{\mathcal{X}^2} g(X, Y) \, \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X, Y) &= \mathbb{E}[g(\mathsf{X}, \mathsf{Y})] \\ &= p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0) g(\emptyset, \emptyset) + \sum_{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y}) \\ &\quad \times \mathbb{E}\big[g\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}\big((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)\big)\big] \\ &= p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0) g(\emptyset, \emptyset) + \sum_{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y}) \\ &\quad \times \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}+k_\mathsf{Y}}} g\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}})\big) \, \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}}) \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

for any integrable function $g\colon \mathcal{X}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$. As in the single-PP case, $g(X,Y) = \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}((X,Y))\widetilde{g}(X,Y)$ results in an integral expression similar to (5) for any measurable set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}^2$.

The symmetry of the random vectors $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ implies that the corresponding probability measures $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ are symmetric in the following sense. Let $\tau_\mathsf{X}, \tau_\mathsf{Y}$ be permutations on $\{1,\dots,k_\mathsf{X}\}$ and $\{1,\dots,k_\mathsf{Y}\}$, respectively, and define

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{\tau_\mathsf{X},\tau_\mathsf{Y}}\colon (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}+k_\mathsf{Y}} &\to (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}+k_\mathsf{Y}} \\ (\boldsymbol{x}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{x}_{k_\mathsf{X}},\boldsymbol{y}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{y}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}) &\mapsto (\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_\mathsf{X}(1)},\dots,\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_\mathsf{X}(k_\mathsf{X})},\boldsymbol{y}_{\tau_\mathsf{Y}(1)},\dots,\boldsymbol{y}_{\tau_\mathsf{Y}(k_\mathsf{Y})})\,. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Then, for any measurable $A \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}+k_\mathsf{Y}}$

$$P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}(A) = P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}(\psi_{\tau_\mathsf{X},\tau_\mathsf{Y}}(A))\,. \tag{13}$$

We will also be interested in marginal probabilities. For a pair of PPs (X,Y), the marginal PP X is defined by the probability measure $P_\mathsf{X}(\mathcal{A}) = P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}\times\mathcal{X})$ for all measurable sets $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. The corresponding probability measures $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}$ for $k_\mathsf{X} \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy

$$p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}(B) = p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},0)P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},0)}(B) + \sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(B\times(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{Y}}\big) \tag{14}$$

for Borel sets $B \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}}$, where for $k_\mathsf{X} \in \mathbb{N}_0$

$$p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X}) = \sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}_0} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})\,. \tag{15}$$

We caution that the probability measures $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}$ and $P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$ are in general not the marginals of $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$. Indeed, $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}$ depends on the probability measures $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ for all $k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$ and, similarly, $P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$ depends on $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ for all $k_\mathsf{X} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ with $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$. In particular, the probability measures of the marginals $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ of $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ generally are not equal to $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}$ and $P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$, respectively.

We will often consider the case of i.i.d. PPs. Two PPs X and Y are *independent* if $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}} = P_\mathsf{X} \times P_\mathsf{Y}$, i.e., for all $\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}, \mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathfrak{S}$

$$\Pr[(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}) \in \mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}] = \Pr[\mathsf{X}\in\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}]\Pr[\mathsf{Y}\in\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}].$$

Furthermore, X and Y are *identically distributed* if their measures P_X and P_Y are equal.

All definitions and results in this section can be readily generalized to more than two PPs. In particular, we will consider sequences of i.i.d. PPs in Section IV.

C. Point Processes of Fixed Cardinality

There are two fundamental differences between spatial PPs and random vectors. One is that the number of elements in a point pattern is a random quantity whereas the dimension of a random vector is deterministic. The second one is that there is no inherent order in the elements of a point pattern. PPs of fixed cardinality differ from random vectors only by this second property. More specifically, we say that a PP X is *of fixed cardinality* $|\mathsf{X}| = k$ if $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) = \Pr[|\mathsf{X}| = k] = 1$ for some given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ (we do not consider the trivial case $k = 0$). The set of all possible outcomes of X is denoted as $\mathcal{X}_k$, i.e., $\mathcal{X}_k \triangleq \{X \in \mathcal{X} : |X| = k\}$. The probability measure P_{X} for a PP X of fixed cardinality $|\mathsf{X}| = k$ simplifies to (cf. (3))

$$P_{\mathsf{X}}(\mathcal{A}) = P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big(\phi_k^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\big)$$

i.e., it is simply the induced measure of $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ under the mapping ϕ_k. The corresponding integral with respect to P_{X} is given by (cf. (5))

$$\int_{\mathcal{A}} g(X)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}(X) = \int_{\phi_k^{-1}(\mathcal{A})} g(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}))\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$

for any measurable set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_k$.

Similarly, a pair of PPs (X, Y) is called *of fixed cardinality* $(|\mathsf{X}|, |\mathsf{Y}|) = (k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}})$ if $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) = 1$ for some given $k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., $\Pr[|\mathsf{X}| = k_{\mathsf{X}}] = 1$ and $\Pr[|\mathsf{Y}| = k_{\mathsf{Y}}] = 1$. The corresponding probability measure $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ satisfies (cf. (10))

$$P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}) = P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\big)$$

and the integral with respect to $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ is given by (cf. (11))

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}^2} g(X,Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y) = \mathbb{E}[g(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y})] = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}+k_{\mathsf{Y}}}} g\big(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}})\big)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}})\,.$$

Because $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k'_{\mathsf{X}}, k'_{\mathsf{Y}}) = 0$ for $(k'_{\mathsf{X}}, k'_{\mathsf{Y}}) \neq (k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}})$, (15) implies $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) = p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) = 1$ and, similarly, $p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{Y}}) = p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) = 1$. Thus, (14) simplifies to

$$P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}(B) = P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big(B \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}\big)\,.$$

Analogously, we obtain $P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(B) = P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big((\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}} \times B\big)$. Hence, the probability measures of the marginals $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ of $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ are given by $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}$ and $P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$, respectively.

D. Point Processes of Equal Cardinality

A setting of particular interest to our study are pairs of PPs that have equal but not necessarily fixed cardinality. More specifically, we say that a pair of PPs (X,Y) has *equal cardinality* if $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})=0$ for $k_{\mathsf{X}}\neq k_{\mathsf{Y}}$, i.e., $\Pr[|\mathsf{X}|=|\mathsf{Y}|]=1$. The corresponding probability measure $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ satisfies (cf. (10))

$$P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A})=p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\emptyset,\emptyset)\big)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\big(\phi_{k,k}^{-1}(\mathcal{A})\big)$$

and the integral with respect to $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ is given by (cf. (11))

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}^2} g(X,Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)&=\mathbb{E}[g(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y})]\\&=p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)g(\emptyset,\emptyset)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k)\,\mathbb{E}\big[g\big(\phi_{k,k}\big((\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\big)\big)\big]\\&=p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)g(\emptyset,\emptyset)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k)\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{2k}}g\big(\phi_{k,k}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k},\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\big)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k},\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\,.\end{aligned}\tag{16}$$

A significant simplification can be observed for the marginal probabilities. Because $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})=0$ for $k_{\mathsf{X}}\neq k_{\mathsf{Y}}$, (15) implies $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)=p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k)$, and (14) simplifies to

$$P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(B)=P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\big(B\times(\mathbb{R}^d)^k\big)$$

for $k\in\mathbb{N}$. Thus, the probability measure of the marginal $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}$ of $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}$ is given by $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}$ and we will write more compactly $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\triangleq\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}$. Analogously, we define $\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\triangleq\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}$, and thus obtain

$$\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)=(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\,.\tag{17}$$

This implies $\phi_{k,k}\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)=\phi_{k,k}\big((\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\big)$. Furthermore, because the distribution of $\phi_{k,k}\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)$ is defined by the probabilities

$$\begin{aligned}\Pr\big[\phi_{k,k}\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}\times\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}\big]&=\Pr\big[\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)\in\phi_{k,k}^{-1}\big(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}\times\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}\big)\big]\\&\overset{(88a)}{=}\Pr\big[\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)\in\phi_{k}^{-1}\big(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}\big)\times\phi_{k}^{-1}\big(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}\big)\big]\\&=\Pr\big[\big(\phi_k\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big),\phi_k\big(\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)\big)\in\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}\times\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}\big]\end{aligned}$$

we also have $\phi_{k,k}\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)=\big(\phi_k\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big),\phi_k\big(\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)\big)$, and thus finally

$$\phi_{k,k}\big((\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\big)=\big(\phi_k\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big),\phi_k\big(\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)\big)\,.\tag{18}$$

Hence, (16) can be equivalently written as

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathcal{X}^2} g(X,Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)&=\mathbb{E}[g(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y})]\\&=p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)g(\emptyset,\emptyset)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k)\,\mathbb{E}\big[g\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}),\phi_k(\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)})\big)\big]\end{aligned}\tag{19}$$

$$= p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)g(\emptyset,\emptyset) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{2k}} g\big(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}), \phi_k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\big)\, \mathrm{d}P^{(k,k)}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\,.$$

III. Mutual Information Between Point Processes

Although mutual information is a very general concept and can be applied to arbitrary probability spaces and random variables, it is most commonly used for continuous or discrete random vectors. To obtain an intuition about the mutual information between PPs, we will analyze several special settings that will also be relevant in the remainder of the paper. The basic definition of mutual information is for discrete random variables x and y with probability mass functions p_{x} and p_{y} and joint probability mass function $p_{\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}}$ [4, eq. (2.28)]:

$$I(\mathsf{x};\mathsf{y}) \triangleq \sum_{i,j} p_{\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}}(x_i, y_j) \log\left(\frac{p_{\mathsf{x},\mathsf{y}}(x_i,y_j)}{p_{\mathsf{x}}(x_i)p_{\mathsf{y}}(y_j)}\right). \tag{20}$$

This definition can be extended to arbitrary random variables. (In our setting, we will consider a pair of PPs (X,Y).) The general definition is traditionally based on (20) and quantizations of the nondiscrete random variables [4, eq. (8.54)]. However, by the Gelfand-Yaglom-Perez theorem [17, Lem. 5.2.3], mutual information can be expressed more conveniently in terms of a Radon-Nikodym derivative: for two random variables[2] X and Y on the same probability space,

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int \log\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}}{\mathrm{d}(P_{\mathsf{X}}\times P_{\mathsf{Y}})}(X,Y)\right) \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y) & \text{if } P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}} \ll P_{\mathsf{X}}\times P_{\mathsf{Y}} \\ \infty & \text{else.} \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

A. General Expression of Mutual Information

Using (21), we can express the mutual information between PPs as a sum of Kullback-Leibler divergences. We recall that the Kullback-Leibler divergence between two probability measures μ and ν on the same measurable space Ω is given as [18, Sec. 1.3]

$$D_{\mathrm{KL}}(\mu\|\nu) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\int_\Omega \log\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}\mu}{\mathrm{d}\nu}(\boldsymbol{x})\right) \mathrm{d}\mu(\boldsymbol{x}) & \text{if } \mu \ll \nu \\ \infty & \text{else}\,. \end{cases} \tag{22}$$

As an important preliminary result, we present a characterization of the Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}}{\mathrm{d}(P_{\mathsf{X}}\times P_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ for a pair of PPs (X,Y). A proof is given in Appendix B.

Lemma 3: Let (X,Y) be a pair of PPs. The following two properties are equivalent:

(i) $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}} \ll P_{\mathsf{X}} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}}$;

[2]We will use (21) mainly for PPs and thus use the notation of PPs. However, it is also valid for random vectors.

(ii) For all $k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \neq 0$, we have $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \ll P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$; for all $k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, 0) \neq 0$, we have $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)} \ll P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}$; and for all $k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \neq 0$, we have $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \ll P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$.

Furthermore, if the equivalent properties (i) and (ii) hold, then

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}}{\mathrm{d}(P_{\mathsf{X}} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}})} = \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$$

where $\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ satisfies

$$\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset, \emptyset) = \frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)} \tag{23a}$$

$$\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}), \emptyset) = \frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, 0)}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)} \frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}}{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) \tag{23b}$$

$$\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset, \phi_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}})) = \frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0, k_{\mathsf{Y}})}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \tag{23c}$$

$$\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}), \phi_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}})) = \frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}})}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}{\mathrm{d}\big(P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \,. \tag{23d}$$

Here, the right-hand side of (23) is understood to be zero if $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) = 0$.

Note that the functions ϕ_k are not one-to-one and thus, e.g., for $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}} \neq \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}$ with $\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) = \phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) = X$, (23b) might seem to give contradictory values for $\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X, \emptyset)$. However, due to our symmetry assumptions on $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$, $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}$, and $P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ (see Sections II-A and II-B), all Radon-Nikodym derivatives on the right-hand side of (23) can be chosen symmetric and thus the values of $\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ given in (23) are consistent.

Using Lemma 3, we can decompose the mutual information between PPs into Kullback-Leibler divergences between measures associated with random vectors. The following theorem is proved in Appendix C.

Theorem 4: The mutual information $I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y})$ for a pair of PPs (X,Y) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) = I(|\mathsf{X}|;|\mathsf{Y}|) &+ \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, 0) D_{\mathrm{KL}}\big(P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)} \big\| P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}\big) \\ &+ \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) D_{\mathrm{KL}}\big(P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \big\| P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big) \\ &+ \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) D_{\mathrm{KL}}\big(P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \big\| P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big) \,. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Note that in general the Kullback-Leibler divergence $D_{\mathrm{KL}}\big(P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \big\| P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big)$ cannot be represented as a mutual information because the probability measures $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}$ and $P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}$ are not the marginals of

the probability measure $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$. However, for a pair of PPs of fixed cardinality or of equal cardinality, a representation as mutual information is possible.

B. Fixed Cardinality

For a pair of PPs (X,Y) of fixed cardinality, i.e., $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) = 1$ for some $k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N}$ (cf. Section II-C), we can relate the mutual information to the mutual information between random vectors. Indeed, since $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$, $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}$, and $P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$ are the probability measures of $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$ and its marginals, $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$, and $\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}$, respectively, we obtain

$$D_{\mathrm{KL}}\big(P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big\|P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})} \times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big) = I\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})};\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)\,.$$

Inserting this into (24) while recalling that $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k'_\mathsf{X},k'_\mathsf{Y}) = 0$ for $(k'_\mathsf{X},k'_\mathsf{Y}) \neq (k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})$ and noting that $I(|\mathsf{X}|;|\mathsf{Y}|) = 0$, Theorem 4 simplifies significantly.

Corollary 5: Let (X,Y) be a pair of PPs of fixed cardinality $(|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|) = (k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})$ for some $k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N}$. Then

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) = I\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})};\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)\,.$$

We can also start with an arbitrary random vector $\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})},\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)$ on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}+k_\mathsf{Y}}$ without assuming any symmetry properties. Again we define a PP by $(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}) = \big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}),\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})})\big)$. Because we did not assume symmetry of the random vector $\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})},\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)$, we here obtain an upper bound on the mutual information $I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y})$ due to the data-processing inequality, but the mutual information $I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})};\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)$ does not necessarily coincide with $I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y})$.

Lemma 6: Let $\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})},\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)$ be a random vector on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}+k_\mathsf{Y}}$, where $k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the pair of PPs $(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}) \triangleq \big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}),\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})})\big)$ satisfies

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) \leq I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})};\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)\,.$$

Proof: We have

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) = I\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})});\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})})\big) \leq I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k_\mathsf{X})};\mathbf{y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big)$$

where the data-processing inequality [17, Corollary 5.5.6] has been used in the final step. ■

C. Equal Cardinality

If (X,Y) is a pair of PPs of equal cardinality (cf. Section II-D), the mutual information $I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y})$ still simplifies significantly compared to the general case.

Corollary 7: Let (X,Y) be a pair of PPs of equal cardinality, i.e., $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})=0$ for $k_{\mathsf{X}}\neq k_{\mathsf{Y}}$. Then

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y})=H(|\mathsf{X}|)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\,I\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)};\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)\,.$$

Proof: We have $|\mathsf{X}|=|\mathsf{Y}|$ and thus (cf. [4, eq. (2.42)]) $I(|\mathsf{X}|;|\mathsf{Y}|)=H(|\mathsf{X}|)$. Furthermore, we have $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})=0$ for $k_{\mathsf{X}}\neq k_{\mathsf{Y}}$. Thus, by Theorem 4, we obtain

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y})=H(|\mathsf{X}|)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k)D_{\mathrm{KL}}\big(P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\big\|P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\times P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)\,.$$

According to (15), $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)=p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k)$. Furthermore, $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}$, $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$, and $P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}$ are the probability measures of $(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}$ and its marginals, $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}$, respectively, and thus (17) implies

$$D_{\mathrm{KL}}\big(P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\big\|P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\times P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)=I\big(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)};\mathbf{y}_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k)}\big)$$

which concludes the proof. ■

IV. Rate-Distortion Function for Point Processes

To set the stage for our main results, we summarize the main concepts of RD theory [4, Sec. 10] in the PP setting. For two point patterns $X,Y\in\mathcal{X}$, let $\rho\colon\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ be a measurable distortion function, i.e., $\rho(X,Y)$ quantifies the distortion incurred by changing X to Y. For example, ρ may be a metric on $\mathcal{X}$ but also more general functions are allowed. We assume that we have a source generating an i.i.d. sequence of PPs $\mathsf{X}[i]$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$. A *source code* $g_n\colon\mathcal{X}^n\to\mathcal{X}^n$ of length $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and rate[3] $R>0$ maps the first n outcomes $(X[1],\ldots,X[n])$ of $\mathsf{X}[i]$ to one of $\lfloor e^{nR}\rfloor$ representation sequences $g_n(X[1],\ldots,X[n])=(Y[1],\ldots,Y[n])\in\mathcal{X}^n$, i.e., $|g_n(\mathcal{X}^n)|\leq\lfloor e^{nR}\rfloor$. The representation sequences are also referred to as *codewords* and the set of all representation sequences $g_n(\mathcal{X}^n)$ is called a *codebook*. The average distortion incurred by a source code g_n is given as $\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_n\big(\mathsf{X}[1:n],g_n(\mathsf{X}[1:n])\big)\big]$. Here, e.g., $\mathsf{X}[1:n]$ is short for $(\mathsf{X}[1],\ldots,\mathsf{X}[n])$, and the vector distortion function $\rho_n(X[1:n],Y[1:n])$ is the average of the distortions between all corresponding components of $X[1:n]$ and $Y[1:n]$, i.e., $\rho_n(X[1:n],Y[1:n])=\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n\rho(X[i],Y[i])$.

An RD pair $(R,D)\in\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2$ is *achievable* if there exists a sequence g_n of source codes of increasing length n such that each g_n has rate R (i.e., $|g_n(\mathcal{X}^n)|\leq\lfloor e^{nR}\rfloor$) and $\lim_{n\to\infty}\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_n(\mathsf{X}[1:n],g_n(\mathsf{X}[1:n]))\big]\leq D$. The *RD function* $R_{\mathsf{X}[i],\rho}(D)$ of an i.i.d. sequence of PPs $\mathsf{X}[i]$ and distortion function ρ is then defined as the infimum of all R such that the pair (R,D) is achievable. Following common practice, we omit an explicit reference to $\mathsf{X}[i]$ and ρ and denote the RD function as $R(D)$ if there is no danger of confusion.

[3]Throughout the paper we define the rate in *nats*.

Furthermore, we specify the source by only one PP X and tacitly assume that the corresponding source sequence consists of i.i.d. PPs with the same distribution as X.

Remark 8: In the vector case, a distortion function $\rho(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y})$ is usually defined based on the difference $\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}$, e.g., the squared error distortion $\rho(\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}) = \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}\|^2$. However, in the case of point patterns X and Y, this convenient construction is not possible because there is no meaningful definition of $X-Y$ as a difference between point patterns. This results in a significantly more involved analysis and construction of source codes.

For simplicity, we will assume $\rho(X,X) = 0$ for all $X \in \mathcal{X}$. Moreover, we will use general theorems for the characterization of RD functions that can also be applied to the setting of PPs. These theorems require the following mild conditions on the source PP X and the distortion function ρ:

(C1) There exists a PP Y such that $I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\rho(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y})] < \infty$.

(C2) There exists a finite set $\mathcal{F} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ such that $\mathbb{E}[\min_{Y\in\mathcal{F}} \rho(\mathsf{X},Y)] < \infty$.

These conditions will be assumed to be satisfied in the remainder of the paper.

The RD theorem for general i.i.d. sources [13, Th. 7.2.4 and Th. 7.2.5] states that for a given source PP X and distortion function ρ, the smallest possible rate for maximum expected distortion D can be calculated as

$$R(D) = R_{\mathsf{X},\rho}(D) = \inf_{\mathsf{Y}:\mathbb{E}[\rho(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y})]\leq D} I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y})\,. \tag{25}$$

The expression (25) is useful for the derivation of upper bounds on the RD function (see Section VI). Another characterization of the RD function that is more useful for the derivation of lower bounds (see Section V) is [15, Th. 2.3]

$$R(D) = \max_{s\geq 0} \max_{\alpha_s(\cdot)>0} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \log \alpha_s(X)\, \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}(X) - sD \right) \tag{26}$$

where the inner maximization is over all positive functions $\alpha_s \colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \alpha_s(X) e^{-s\rho(X,Y)}\, \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}(X) \leq 1 \tag{27}$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{X}$. If we assume that the measures $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ are absolutely continuous with respect to $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$ with Radon-Nikodym derivatives[4] $\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}}{\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k} = f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$, then (26) and (27) can equivalently be written as follows. Using (4) with $g(X) = \log \alpha_s(X)$, (26) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} R(D) = \max_{s\geq 0} \max_{\alpha_s(\cdot)>0} \Bigg(& p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) \log \alpha_s(\emptyset) \\ & + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \log \alpha_s(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}))\, f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) - sD \Bigg)\,. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

[4]This implies that the $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ are continuous random vectors with probability density function $f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$.

Here, the inner maximization is over all positive functions $\alpha_s\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying (using (4) with $g(X) = \alpha_s(X)e^{-s\rho(X,Y)}$ in (27))

$$p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\alpha_s(\emptyset)e^{-s\rho(\emptyset,Y)} + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \alpha_s(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}))e^{-s\rho(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)} f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \le 1 \tag{29}$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{X}$. In particular, (28) yields a *lower bound* on the RD function by omitting the maximization over α_s and inserting any specific positive function α_s satisfying (29).

V. Lower Bounds

Lower bounds on the RD function are notoriously hard to obtain. The only well-established lower bound is the Shannon lower bound, which is based on the characterization of the RD function given in (26), (27). More specifically, for any α_s satisfying (27), equation (26) implies

$$R(D) \ge \max_{s\ge 0} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \log \alpha_s(X)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}(X) - sD \right). \tag{30}$$

The standard approach [16, Sec. 4] is to set

$$\alpha_s(X) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{f_{\mathsf{X}}(X)\gamma(s)} & \text{if } f_{\mathsf{X}}(X) \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } f_{\mathsf{X}}(X) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

where $f_{\mathsf{X}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}}{\mathrm{d}Q}$ is the Radon-Nikodym derivative of P_{X} with respect to some background measure Q on the given measurable space $(\mathcal{X}, \mathfrak{S})$ that satisfies $P_{\mathsf{X}} \ll Q$, and $\gamma(s)$, $s \ge 0$ is a suitably chosen function. Inserting (31) into (30) then results in the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} R(D) &\ge \max_{s\ge 0} \left(\int_{\mathcal{X}} \big(-\log f_{\mathsf{X}}(X) - \log\gamma(s) \big) f_{\mathsf{X}}(X)\,\mathrm{d}Q(X) - sD \right) \\ &= -\int_{\mathcal{X}} f_{\mathsf{X}}(X) \log f_{\mathsf{X}}(X)\,\mathrm{d}Q(X) + \max_{s\ge 0}(-\log\gamma(s) - sD) \end{aligned}$$

where $\gamma(s)$ has to satisfy (cf. (27))

$$\int_{\mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{\gamma(s)} e^{-s\rho(X,Y)}\,\mathrm{d}Q(X) \le 1 \qquad \text{for all } Y \in \mathcal{X}$$

or, equivalently,

$$\gamma(s) \ge \int_{\mathcal{X}} e^{-s\rho(X,Y)}\,\mathrm{d}Q(X) \qquad \text{for all } Y \in \mathcal{X}\,.$$

This standard approach suggests to define $\gamma(s)$ independently of the cardinality of X and is thus too restrictive for the construction of useful lower bounds. We take a slightly different approach and define

$$\alpha_s(X) \triangleq \frac{1}{f_{\mathsf{X}}(X)\gamma_{|X|}(s)}$$

with appropriate functions $\gamma_{|X|}(s)$ that depend on $|\mathsf{X}|$. More specifically, we propose the following bound.

Theorem 9: Let X be a PP on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and assume that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the measure $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$ with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}}{\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k} = f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ is a continuous random vector with probability density function $f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$. For any measurable sets $A_k \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ satisfying $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(A_k) = 1$, i.e., $f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = 0$ for $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$-almost all $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \in (A_k)^c$, the RD function is lower-bounded according to

$$R(D) \geq \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) h\big(f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big) + \max_{s\geq 0} \bigg(- \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \log \gamma_k(s) - sD \bigg) \tag{32}$$

where γ_k are any functions satisfying

$$\gamma_k(s) \geq \begin{cases} e^{-s\rho(\emptyset,Y)} & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \int_{A_k} e^{-s\rho(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) & \text{if } k \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases} \tag{33}$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{X}$ and $s \geq 0$.

Proof: The characterization of the RD function in (28) implies that for any α_s satisfying (29), we obtain the lower bound

$$\begin{aligned} R(D) &\geq \max_{s\geq 0} \bigg(p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) \log \alpha_s(\emptyset) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \log \alpha_s(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})) \, f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) - sD \bigg) \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} \max_{s\geq 0} \bigg(p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) \log \alpha_s(\emptyset) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \int_{A_k} \log \alpha_s(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})) \, f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) - sD \bigg) \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

where (a) holds because we assumed that $f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = 0$ for $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$-almost all $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \in (A_k)^c$. Using functions γ_k satisfying (33), we construct α_s as

$$\alpha_s(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})) \triangleq \begin{cases} \frac{1}{f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\gamma_k(s)} & \text{if } f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \neq 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{35}$$

for $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ and

$$\alpha_s(\emptyset) \triangleq \frac{1}{\gamma_0(s)} \,. \tag{36}$$

Due to (33), the functions γ_k satisfy

$$p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) \frac{1}{\gamma_0(s)} e^{-s\rho(\emptyset,Y)} + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \int_{A_k} \frac{1}{\gamma_k(s)} e^{-s\rho(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \leq p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) = 1$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{X}$, which is recognized as the condition (29) evaluated for the functions α_s given by (35) and (36). Inserting (35) and (36) into (34) gives

$$R(D) \geq \max_{s\geq 0} \bigg(p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) \log \frac{1}{\gamma_0(s)}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\int_{A_k} f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\log\left(\frac{1}{f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\gamma_k(s)}\right)\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})-sD\Bigg)\\
&=\max_{s\geq 0}\Bigg(-p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\log\gamma_0(s)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\Bigg(-\int_{A_k} f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\log f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\\
&\quad-\int_{A_k} f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\log\gamma_k(s)\,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\Bigg)-sD\Bigg)\\
&=\max_{s\geq 0}\Bigg(-p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\log\gamma_0(s)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\Big(h\big(f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big)-\log\gamma_k(s)\Big)-sD\Bigg)
\end{aligned}
$$

which is equivalent to (32). ■

VI. Upper Bounds

We will use two different approaches to calculate upper bounds on the RD function. The first one is based on the RD theorem—i.e., the expression (25)—and the data-processing inequality whereas the second one uses concrete codes and the operational interpretation of the RD function.

A. Upper Bounds Based on the Rate-Distortion Theorem

Let X be a PP defined by the cardinality distribution $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}$ and the random vectors $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ (cf. Section II-A). To calculate upper bounds, we can construct an arbitrary PP Y (which, in general, is dependent on X) such that the expected distortion between X and Y satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\rho(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y})]\leq D$. According to (25), we then have $R(D)\leq I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y})$. However, it is often easier to construct vectors $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ that do not satisfy the symmetry properties we assumed in the construction of PPs. The following theorem, whose proof is provided in Appendix D, shows that in the case where $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ is a "symmetrized" version of $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$, we can construct upper bounds on $R(D)$ based on $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}^{(k)})$.

Theorem 10: Let X be a PP on $\mathbb{R}^d$ defined by the cardinality distribution $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}$ and the random vectors $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$. Furthermore, for each $k\in\mathbb{N}$, let $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ be any random vector on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{2k}$ such that $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ has the same distribution as $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)})$. Finally, assume that

$$
\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\,\mathbb{E}\big[\rho\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}),\phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big]\leq D\,. \tag{37}
$$

Then

$$
R(D)\leq H(|\mathsf{X}|)+\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\,I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)};\mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big)\,. \tag{38}
$$

B. Codebook-Based Upper Bounds

Due to the operational interpretation of the RD function, we can easily calculate upper bounds on the RD function if we are able to construct good source codes for a given PP. For simplicity, we will focus on the case of coding only one point pattern at a time rather than blocks of successive point patterns (i.e., the length of the source code is $n = 1$), although this may limit the tightness of our upper bounds. The theoretical background of the bounds in this section is the following well-known fact [4, Sec. 10.2]: If an RD pair $(\widetilde{R}, \widetilde{D})$ is achieved by a source code, then the RD function at $\widetilde{D}$ has to be smaller than or equal to $\widetilde{R}$. More formally, let X be a PP and assume that there exists a source code $g\colon \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{X}$ of length $n = 1$ such that[5] $|g(\mathcal{X})| = M$. If $\mathbb{E}[\rho(\mathsf{X}, g(\mathsf{X}))] \leq \widetilde{D}$, then the RD function at $\widetilde{D}$ is upper-bounded according to

$$R(\widetilde{D}) \leq \log M\,. \tag{39}$$

The construction of good source codes, even in the vector case, is a demanding and non-analytical optimization task. In the case of PPs, this task is further complicated by the absence of a meaningful vector space structure of sets—even the definition of a "mean" of point patterns is not straightforward. Our construction is motivated by the well-known Lloyd algorithm [19], which, for a given number M of codewords, alternately finds M "centers" $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ and constructs an associated partition $\{\mathcal{A}_j\}_{j=1,\ldots,M}$ of $\mathcal{X}$. The resulting centers $X_1, \ldots, X_M$ can be used as codewords and the associated source code g is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} g\colon \mathcal{X} &\to \mathcal{X} \\ X &\mapsto \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{X_j \in \{X_1,\ldots,X_M\}} \rho(X, X_j)\,. \end{aligned}$$

That is, a point pattern $X \in \mathcal{X}$ is encoded into the center point pattern X_j that is closest to X in the sense of minimizing the distortion $\rho(X, X_j)$. In our setting, the Lloyd algorithm can be formalized as follows:

- Input: PP X; distortion function $\rho\colon \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$; number $M \in \mathbb{N}$ of codewords.
- Initialization: Randomly draw M different initial codewords $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ according to the distribution of X.
- Step 1: Find a partition of $\mathcal{X}$ into M disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}_j$ such that the distortion incurred by changing $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ to X_j is less than or equal to the distortion incurred by changing X to any other $X_{j'}$, $j' \neq j$, i.e., $\rho(X, X_j) \leq \rho(X, X_{j'})$ for all $j' \neq j$ and all $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$.

[5]Note that M is the number of codewords and we can always write $M = e^{\widetilde{R}}$ to obtain the rate of the code as $\widetilde{R} = \log M$.

- Step 2: For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, find a new codeword associated with $\mathcal{A}_j$ that has the smallest expected distortion from all point patterns in $\mathcal{A}_j$, i.e., a "center point pattern" X_j (replacing the previous X_j) satisfying
$$X_j = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\widetilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{E}_{\mathsf{X}|\mathsf{X} \in \mathcal{A}_j}[\rho(\mathsf{X}, \widetilde{X})] \,.$$
- Repeat Step 1 and Step 2 until some convergence criterion is satisfied.
- Output: codebook $\{X_1, \ldots, X_M\}$.

Unfortunately, this formal approach has some issues. Firstly, we may not know the source distribution, but only have available a large number of source realizations, i.e., samples of the PP. Secondly, closed-form solutions for Steps 1 and 2 do not exist in general. A workaround for both problems is an approach known in vector quantization as Linde-Buzo-Gray algorithm [14]. Here, a codebook is constructed based on a given set $\mathcal{A}$ of source realizations and we do not need the distribution of the source random variable X explicitly. However, if the distribution of X is known, we can generate the set $\mathcal{A}$ by drawing i.i.d. samples from X. The algorithm adapted to our setting can be stated as follows:

- Input: a set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$ containing $|\mathcal{A}| < \infty$ point patterns; distortion function $\rho\colon \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$; number M of codewords.
- Initialization: Randomly choose M different initial codewords $X_j \in \mathcal{A}$.
- Step 1: Find a partition of $\mathcal{A}$ into M disjoint subsets $\mathcal{A}_j$ such that the distortion incurred by changing $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ to X_j is less than or equal to the distortion incurred by changing X to any other $X_{j'}$, $j' \neq j$, i.e., $\rho(X, X_j) \leq \rho(X, X_{j'})$ for all $j' \neq j$ and all $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$.
- Step 2: For each $j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$, find a new codeword associated with $\mathcal{A}_j$ that has the smallest average distortion from all point patterns in $\mathcal{A}_j$, i.e., a "center point pattern" $X_j \in \mathcal{X}$ (replacing the previous X_j) satisfying
$$X_j = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\widetilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho(X, \widetilde{X}) \,. \tag{40}$$
- Repeat Step 1 and Step 2 until some convergence criterion is satisfied.
- Output: codebook $\{X_1, \ldots, X_M\}$.

Step 1 can be performed by calculating $|\mathcal{A}|M$ times a distortion $\rho(X, X_j)$. However, Step 2 is typically computationally unfeasible: in many cases, finding a center point pattern of a finite collection $\mathcal{A}_j$ of point patterns according to (40) is equivalent to solving a multi-dimensional assignment problem, which is known to be NP-hard. Hence, we will have to resort to approximate or heuristic solutions. At this point, it is noteworthy that we do not have to solve the optimization problem exactly in order to obtain upper bounds on the RD function. We merely have to construct a source code that can be analyzed, no matter what heuristics or approximations were used in its construction. A convergence analysis of the proposed

algorithm appears to be difficult. Indeed, even the convergence behavior of the Lloyd algorithm in $\mathbb{R}^d$ is not completely understood [20].

C. Error Analysis

When establishing an upper bound using (39) for some source code g, we have to calculate the expected distortion $\mathbb{E}[\rho(\mathsf{X}, g(\mathsf{X}))]$. Also in the setting of Theorem 10, we have to calculate $\mathbb{E}\big[\rho\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big]$ to obtain bounds on the RD function. In both cases, a closed-form expression of the expected distortion is not available, and we will thus resort to Monte Carlo methods. The basis for this approach is the law of large numbers. More specifically, we will use the following result [21, Ex. 2.10].

Lemma 11: Let $\mathsf{x}_1, \mathsf{x}_2, \dots$ be a sequence of i.i.d. random variables on $\mathbb{R}$. Assume that $\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{x}_1] = \theta < \infty$ and $\mathbb{E}[\mathsf{x}_1^2] < \infty$. For $\bar{\mathsf{x}}_n \triangleq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n \mathsf{x}_i$, $\mathsf{s}_n^2 \triangleq \frac{1}{n-1}\sum_{i=1}^n (\mathsf{x}_i - \bar{\mathsf{x}}_i)^2$, and $\alpha \in (0,1)$, the probability that $\bar{\mathsf{x}}_n + \frac{\mathsf{s}_n}{\sqrt{n}}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \geq \theta$ is asymptotically ($n \to \infty$) equal to α. Here, Φ denotes the cumulative distribution function of a standard normal distribution.

Although Lemma 11 is an asymptotic result, it is often used as an approximation for finite n, i.e., $\Pr\left[\bar{\mathsf{x}}_n + \frac{\mathsf{s}_n}{\sqrt{n}}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \geq \theta\right] \approx \alpha$. In Section VII-D, we will use this approach to calculate approximate upper bounds on the expected distortions.

VII. Point Processes of Fixed Cardinality

In this section, we present lower and upper bounds on the RD function for PPs of fixed cardinality as discussed in Section II-C. We thus restrict our analysis to source codes and distortion functions on the subset $\mathcal{X}_k = \{X \in \mathcal{X} : |X| = k\} \subseteq \mathcal{X}$. The assumption of fixed cardinality leads to more concrete bounds and enables a comparison with the vector viewpoint.

A. Lower Bound

For a PP X of fixed cardinality, the RD lower bound in Theorem 9 simplifies as follows.

Corollary 12: Let X be a PP on $\mathbb{R}^d$ of fixed cardinality $|\mathsf{X}| = k$, i.e., $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) = 1$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Assume that the measure $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$ with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}}{\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k} = f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$. Then the RD function is lower-bounded according to

$$R(D) \geq h\big(f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big) + \max_{s \geq 0}(-\log \gamma_k(s) - sD) \tag{41}$$

where γ_k are any functions satisfying

$$\gamma_k(s) \geq \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} e^{-s\rho(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}), Y)}\, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \tag{42}$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{X}_k = \{X \in \mathcal{X} : |X| = k\}$.

Next, we will specialize Corollary 12 to a concrete distortion function ρ. Consider point patterns $X = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_k\}$ and $Y = \{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_k\}$ of equal cardinality k. We then define the distortion function as

$$\rho_2(X, Y) \triangleq \min_{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau(i)}\|^2 \tag{43}$$

where the minimum is taken with respect to all permutations τ of $\{1, \ldots, k\}$. This is a squared optimal assignment metric that can be viewed as a natural counterpart of the classical squared error distortion function of vectors. We note that a generalization to sets X, Y of different cardinalities leads to the squared optimal subpattern assignment (OSPA) metric[6] defined in [12]. We can now analyze the condition (42) for the distortion function ρ_2 in (43) and obtain a more specific lower bound.

Theorem 13: Let X be a PP on $\mathbb{R}^d$ of fixed cardinality $|\mathsf{X}| = k$. Assume that the measure $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ is absolutely continuous with respect to $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$ with Radon-Nikodym derivative $\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}}{\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k} = f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$. Then the RD function for distortion function ρ_2 is lower-bounded according to

$$R(D) \geq h\big(f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big) - \frac{kd}{2}\left(1 + \log\left(\frac{2\pi D}{kd}\right)\right) - \log k! \,. \tag{44}$$

Proof: For $Y = \{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_k\}$, the integral on the right-hand side of (42) satisfies

$$\begin{aligned}
\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) &= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} e^{-s\min_\tau \sum_{i=1}^k \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau(i)}\|^2} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \max_\tau \left(e^{-s\sum_{i=1}^k \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau(i)}\|^2}\right) \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&\overset{(a)}{\leq} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \left(\sum_\tau e^{-s\sum_{i=1}^k \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau(i)}\|^2}\right) \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&= \sum_\tau \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} e^{-s\sum_{i=1}^k \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau(i)}\|^2} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&= k! \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}\|^2} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&= k!\left(\frac{\pi}{s}\right)^{kd/2}
\end{aligned} \tag{45}$$

where in (a) we upper-bounded the maximum of positive functions by their sum. Let us set $\gamma_k(s) \triangleq k!\big(\frac{\pi}{s}\big)^{kd/2}$. Then, by (45), the functions $\gamma_k(s)$ satisfy (42). Thus, inserting these $\gamma_k(s)$ into (41), we obtain the lower bound

$$R(D) \geq h\big(f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big) + \max_{s \geq 0} \left(- \log\left(k!\left(\frac{\pi}{s}\right)^{kd/2}\right) - sD \right). \tag{46}$$

[6]In [12], the OSPA metric is defined with a normalization factor $1/k$, which is omitted in our analysis.

The maximum can be easily calculated to be located at $s = kd/(2D)$, and thus (46) simplifies to

$$R(D) \geq h\big(f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}\big) - \frac{kd}{2} - \frac{kd}{2}\log\left(\frac{2\pi D}{kd}\right) - \log k!$$

which is (44). ∎

Let us compare the bound (44) with the classical Shannon lower bound for a random vector $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ with probability density function $f_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}}$ and squared error distortion, which is given by [16, eq. (4.8.8)]

$$R_{\text{vec}}(D) \geq h\big(f_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}}\big) - \frac{kd}{2}\left(1 + \log\left(\frac{2\pi D}{kd}\right)\right). \tag{47}$$

We see that the "vector bound" (47) is higher than the "set bound" (44) by the constant offset $\log k!$. This offset corresponds to the maximal information that a vector contains in addition to the information present in the set, i.e., the maximal information provided by the *ordering* of the k elements. Indeed, there are $k!$ possible orderings, and the "information content" of the ordering is maximal if all of these $k!$ orderings are assumed equally likely, in which case it is given by $\log k!$. For $D \to 0$, the bound (44) shows that the asymptotic behavior of the RD function for small distortions is similar to the vector case. In particular, we expect that an analysis of the RD dimension [22] of PPs can be based on our lower bound (44) and the asymptotic tightness of the Shannon lower bound in the vector case [23]. On the other hand, (44) does not allow us to analyze the RD function for $k \to \infty$, as the resulting bounds quickly fall below zero.

B. Upper Bound Based on the Rate-Distortion Theorem

We can also concretize the upper bounds from Section VI for PPs of fixed cardinality. Theorem 10 becomes particularly simple.

Corollary 14: Let X be a PP on $\mathbb{R}^d$ of fixed cardinality $|\mathsf{X}| = k$. Denote by $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ the associated symmetric random vector on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$. Furthermore, let $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ be any random vector on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^{2k}$ such that $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ has the same distribution as $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)})$. Finally, assume that

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big] \leq D\,. \tag{48}$$

Then the RD function for distortion function ρ_2, at distortion D, is upper-bounded according to

$$R(D) \leq I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big)\,. \tag{49}$$

We can simplify the bound (48) by using the following relation of ρ_2 to the squared error distortion of vectors:

$$\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}), \phi_k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\big) = \min_{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau(i)}\|^2 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{k} \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_i\|^2 = \|\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} - \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}\|^2\,.$$

Thus, $\mathbb{E}\big[\|\mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\|^2\big] \leq D$ implies (48). One can conclude that the upper bound $I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)};\mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big)$ on the RD function of a random source vector $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ based on an arbitrary random vector $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ satisfying $\mathbb{E}\big[\|\mathbf{x}^{(k)} - \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\|^2\big] \leq D$, is also an upper bound on the RD function of the corresponding fixed-cardinality PP $\mathsf{X} = \phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$.

C. Codebook-Based Upper Bounds

We can obtain significantly better upper bounds by constructing explicit source codes using a variation of the Linde-Buzo-Gray algorithm described in Section VI-B. We will specify the two iteration steps of the proposed algorithm for point patterns of fixed cardinality k. In Step 1, for a given set $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{X}_k$ of point patterns and M center point patterns X_j^*, we have to associate each point pattern $X \in \mathcal{A}$ with the closest center point pattern X_j^* (closest refers to minimal distortion ρ_2). This requires an evaluation of $\rho_2(X, X_j^*)$ for each $X \in \mathcal{A}$ and each $j \in \{1, \ldots, M\}$. If several distances $\rho_2(X, X_j^*)$ are minimal for a given X, we use the tie break rule of choosing the one with the smallest index j. All point patterns $X \in \mathcal{A}$ that are associated with the center point pattern X_j^* are collected in the set $\mathcal{A}_j$. In Step 2, for each subset $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \mathcal{A}$, we have to find an updated center point pattern X_j^* of smallest average distortion from all point patterns in $\mathcal{A}_j$, i.e.,

$$X_j^* = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\widetilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}_k} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, \widetilde{X})\,. \tag{50}$$

We can reformulate the optimization problem (50) as the task of finding an "optimal" permutation[7] (corresponding to an ordering) τ_X^* of each point pattern $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ according to the following lemma. A proof is given in Appendix E.

Lemma 15: Let $\mathcal{A}_j \subseteq \mathcal{X}_k$ be a finite collection of point patterns in $\mathbb{R}^d$ of fixed cardinality $k \in \mathbb{N}$, i.e., for all $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$, we have $X = \big\{\boldsymbol{x}_1^{(X)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_k^{(X)}\big\}$ with $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(X)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then a center point pattern[8] $X_j^* = \arg\min_{\widetilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}_k} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, \widetilde{X})$ is given as

$$X_j^* = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1^*, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_k^*\} \qquad \text{with } \boldsymbol{x}_i^* = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X^*(i)}^{(X)} \tag{51}$$

where the collection of permutations $\{\tau_X^*\}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j}$ is given by

$$\{\tau_X^*\}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\{\tau_X\}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \sum_{X' \in \mathcal{A}_j} \big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big\|^2\,. \tag{52}$$

[7]Our notation τ_X^* indicates that the permutation depends on the point pattern X. Indeed, we will consider a collection of permutations $\{\tau_X^*\}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j}$ that contains one permutation τ_X^* for each point pattern $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$.

[8]The center point pattern is not necessarily unique.



Fig. 1. Cliques C_i for $\mathcal{A}_j = \{W, X, Y\}$, $k = 4$, and permutations $\{\tau_X\}_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j} = \{\tau_W, \tau_X, \tau_Y\}$ with $\tau_W(1) = 2$, $\tau_W(2) = 1$, $\tau_W(3) = 3$, $\tau_W(4) = 4$; $\tau_X(1) = 3$, $\tau_X(2) = 4$, $\tau_X(3) = 2$, $\tau_X(4) = 1$; and $\tau_Y(1) = 4$, $\tau_Y(2) = 1$, $\tau_Y(3) = 2$, $\tau_Y(4) = 3$. Note that, e.g., $\tau_X(4) = 1$ expresses the fact that $x_1 \in C_4$.

By Lemma 15, the minimization problem in (50) is equivalent to a *multi-dimensional assignment problem*. Indeed, a collection of permutations $\{\tau_X\}_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}$ corresponds to a choice of k *cliques*[9]

$$C_i \triangleq \big\{\boldsymbol{x}^{(X)}_{\tau_X(i)} : X \in \mathcal{A}_j\big\}, \qquad i = 1, \dots, k\,. \tag{53}$$

Thus, for each point pattern $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$, τ_X assigns each of the k vectors in X to one of k different cliques, such that no two vectors in X are assigned to the same clique. Each resulting clique hence contains $|C_i| = |\mathcal{A}_j|$ vectors—one from each $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$—and each vector $\boldsymbol{x} \in X$ belongs to exactly one clique for all $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$. Note that the union of all vectors in all $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ is the same as the union of all vectors in all cliques C_i, i.e., $\bigcup_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j} X = \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} C_i$. The relation between the cliques C_i and the point patterns $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ is illustrated in Figure 1.

We define the *cost* of a clique C_i as the sum

$$\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in C_i}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}'\in C_i} \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}'\|^2 = \sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j} \big\|\boldsymbol{x}^{(X)}_{\tau_X(i)} - \boldsymbol{x}^{(X')}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}\big\|^2\,. \tag{54}$$

Finding the collection of cliques $\{C_i^*\}_{i=1,\dots,k}$ with minimal sum cost, i.e.,

$$\{C_i^*\}_{i=1,\dots,k} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\{C_i\}_{i=1,\dots,k}} \sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}\in C_i}\sum_{\boldsymbol{x}'\in C_i} \|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{x}'\|^2 \tag{55}$$

is then equivalent to finding the optimal collection of permutations in (52). Moreover, according to its definition in (54), the cost of a clique is decomposable in the sense that it can be decomposed into a

[9] This multi-dimensional assignment problem can also be formulated as a graph-theoretic problem where a *clique* corresponds to a complete subgraph. For details see [24].

sum of squared distances, each between two of its members. Thus, the minimization in (55) is a multi-dimensional assignment problem with decomposable costs. Although finding an exact solution to such a problem is not computationally feasible for large k and large clique sizes $|C_i| = |\mathcal{A}_j|$, there exist various heuristic algorithms producing approximate solutions [24]–[26]. Because we are mainly interested in the case of a large clique size, we will merely use a variation of the basic single-hub heuristic and the multi-hub heuristic presented in [24]. Since these heuristic algorithms are used in Step 2 of the proposed Linde-Buzo-Gray algorithm, we will label the corresponding steps as 2.1–2.3. The classical single-hub heuristic is based on assigning the vectors $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(X)}$ in each point pattern $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ to the k different cliques (using a permutation τ_X) by minimizing the sum of squared distances between the vectors $\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau(i)}^{(X)}$ and the vectors $\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(X_1)}$ of one "hub" point pattern X_1. More specifically, the algorithm (corresponding to Step 2 of the Linde-Buzo-Gray algorithm) is given as follows.

- Input: a collection $\mathcal{A}_j$ of point patterns; each point pattern $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ contains k points in $\mathbb{R}^d$.
- Initialization: Choose a point pattern $X_1 \in \mathcal{A}_j$ (called the *hub*) and define $\tau_{X_1}(i) = i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, k$.
- Step 2.1: For each $X = \big\{\boldsymbol{x}_1^{(X)}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_k^{(X)}\big\} \in \mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{X_1\}$, find the best assignment between the vectors in X and X_1, i.e., a permutation

$$\tau_X = \arg\min_{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau(i)}^{(X)} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(X_1)}\big\|^2 . \tag{56}$$

- Step 2.2: Define the clique C_i according to (53), i.e.,

$$C_i \triangleq \big\{\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} : X \in \mathcal{A}_j\big\}, \qquad i = 1, \ldots, k\,. \tag{57}$$

- Step 2.3: Define the center point pattern X_j^* as the union of the centers (arithmetic means) of all cliques, i.e.,

$$X_j^* \triangleq \bigcup_{i=1}^{k} \big\{\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{C_i}\big\} \qquad \text{with } \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{C_i} \triangleq \frac{1}{|C_i|} \sum_{\boldsymbol{x} \in C_i} \boldsymbol{x}\,. \tag{58}$$

- Output: approximate center point pattern X_j^*.

The above heuristic requires only $|\mathcal{A}_j| - 1$ optimal assignments between point patterns. However, the accuracy of the resulting approximate center point pattern X_j^* strongly depends on the choice of the hub X_1 and can be very bad for certain choices of X_1. The more robust multi-hub heuristic [24] performs the single-hub algorithm with all $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ as alternative hubs X_1, which can be shown to increase the complexity to $\frac{(|\mathcal{A}_j|-1)|\mathcal{A}_j|}{2}$ optimal assignments, i.e., by a factor of $|\mathcal{A}_j|/2$. We here propose a different heuristic that has almost the same complexity as the single-hub heuristic but is more robust. The idea of our approach is to replace the best assignment to the single hub X_1 by an optimal assignment to the center point pattern of the subsets defined in the preceding steps. More specifically, we start with a hub

$X_1 \in \mathcal{A}_j$ and, as in the single-hub heuristic, search for the best assignment τ_{X_2} (see (56) with $X = X_2$) between the vectors in a randomly chosen $X_2 \in \mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{X_1\}$ and X_1. Then, we calculate the center point pattern $\hat{X}_2$ of X_1 and X_2 as in (57) and (58) but with $\mathcal{A}_j$ replaced by $\{X_1, X_2\}$. In the next step, we choose a random $X_3 \in \mathcal{A}_j \setminus \{X_1, X_2\}$ and find the optimal assignment τ_{X_3} between the vectors in X_3 and $\hat{X}_2$. An approximate center point pattern $\hat{X}_3$ of X_1, X_2, and X_3 is then calculated as in (57) and (58) but with $\mathcal{A}_j$ replaced by $\{X_1, X_2, X_3\}$. Equivalently, we can calculate $\hat{X}_3$ as a "weighted" center point pattern of X_3 and $\hat{X}_2$. We proceed in the same way with all point patterns in $\mathcal{A}_j$, always calculating the optimal assignment τ_{X_r} ($r = 4, 5, \dots$) between the vectors in X_r and the approximate center point pattern $\hat{X}_{r-1}$ of the previous $r-1$ point patterns. A formal statement of the algorithm is as follows.

- Input: a collection $\mathcal{A}_j$ of point patterns; each point pattern $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$ contains k points in $\mathbb{R}^d$.
- Initialization: (Randomly) order the point patterns $X \in \mathcal{A}_j$, i.e., choose a sequence $(X_1, \dots, X_{|\mathcal{A}_j|})$ where the X_r are all the elements of $\mathcal{A}_j$. Set the initial subset center point pattern $\hat{X}_1$ to X_1.
- For $r = 2, \dots, |\mathcal{A}_j|$:
  - Step 2.1: Find the best assignment between the vectors in X_r and $\hat{X}_{r-1}$, i.e., a permutation
$$\tau_{X_r} = \arg\min_{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau(i)}^{(X_r)} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^{(\hat{X}_{r-1})} \right\|^2 .$$
  - Step 2.2: Generate an updated subset center point pattern $\hat{X}_r = \left\{ \boldsymbol{x}_1^{(\hat{X}_r)}, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_k^{(\hat{X}_r)} \right\}$ according to
$$\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(\hat{X}_r)} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{s=1}^{r} \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X_s}(i)}^{(X_s)} = \frac{(r-1)\boldsymbol{x}_i^{(\hat{X}_{r-1})} + \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X_r}(i)}^{(X_r)}}{r}, \qquad i = 1, \dots, k . \tag{59}$$
- Output: approximate center point pattern $\hat{X}_{|\mathcal{A}_j|}$.

As in the case of the single-hub heuristic, we only have to perform $|\mathcal{A}_j| - 1$ optimal assignments. The complexity of the additional center update (59) is negligible. On the other hand, the multi-hub approach can be easily parallelized whereas our algorithm works only sequentially.

D. Example: Gaussian Distribution

As an example, we consider the case of a PP X on $\mathbb{R}^2$ of fixed cardinality $|\mathsf{X}| = k$ whose points are independently distributed according to a standard Gaussian distribution on $\mathbb{R}^2$, i.e., $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)} \in (\mathbb{R}^2)^k$ has i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian entries with variance 1. We want to compare the upper bounds presented in Sections VII-B and VII-C to the RD function for the vector setting, i.e., to the RD function of a standard Gaussian vector $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ in $(\mathbb{R}^2)^k$. In the PP setting, we use the distortion ρ_2 (see (43)), while in the vector setting, we use the conventional squared error distortion. The RD function for $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ in the vector setting can be calculated in closed form; assuming $D \leq 2k$, it is equal to

$$R_{\text{vec}}(D) = k \log \left(\frac{2k}{D} \right) . \tag{60}$$

This result was shown (cf. [4, Sec. 10.3.2]) by using the RD theorem for the vector case, i.e., (25) with obvious modifications, and choosing $\mathbf{x}^{(k)} = \mathbf{y}^{(k)} + \mathbf{w}^{(k)}$, where $\mathbf{w}^{(k)}$ has i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian entries with variance $D/(2k)$ and $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ thus has i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian entries with variance $1 - D/(2k)$. This choice can be shown to achieve the infimum in the RD theorem and hence the mutual information $I(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ is equal to the RD function.

Motivated by the optimality in the vector case, we use a similar approach and Corollary 14 in the PP case. However, this will only result in upper bounds as the infimum in (25) is not necessarily achieved. Let X be a PP of fixed cardinality $|\mathsf{X}| = k$, where $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ has i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian entries with variance 1. We choose $\mathbf{x}^{(k)} = \mathbf{y}^{(k)} + \mathbf{w}^{(k)}$, where $\mathbf{w}^{(k)}$ has i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian entries with variance σ^2 and $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ has i.i.d. zero-mean Gaussian entries with variance $1 - \sigma^2$. The random vectors $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ and $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ have the same distribution, and the right-hand side in (49) is here obtained as

$$I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big) = k \log\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right). \tag{61}$$

According to Corollary 14, equation (61) is an upper bound on the RD function $R(D)$ at distortion D if (48) is satisfied, i.e.,

$$R(D) \leq k \log\left(\frac{1}{\sigma^2}\right). \tag{62}$$

To find D such that (48) holds, we use the asymptotic upper bound on the expected distortion presented in Lemma 11, i.e., we obtain with approximate probability α

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big] \leq \bar{\mathsf{x}}_n + \frac{\mathsf{s}_n}{\sqrt{n}}\Phi^{-1}(\alpha) \triangleq D$$

where the sequence x_i that generates $\bar{\mathsf{x}}_n$ and s_n as defined in Lemma 11 is formed by i.i.d. realizations of $\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)$. Choosing $n = 10^5$ and $\alpha = 0.99$, we present in Figure 2 the resulting upper bound (62) for cardinalities $k = 4$ and $k = 30$ in comparison to the corresponding vector RD functions (60). Note that these results demonstrate a significant reduction of the rate in the PP setting relative to the vector setting only for comparatively large values of D.

We also considered codebook-based upper bounds following (39). Using the Linde-Buzo-Gray algorithm presented in Section VI-B, we constructed codebooks for fixed-cardinality PPs with $k = 4$ and $k = 30$ i.i.d. Gaussian points. As input to the Linde-Buzo-Gray algorithm, we used $|\mathcal{A}| = 100 \cdot M$ random realizations of the source PP. In Step 2 of the algorithm, we employed the multi-hub heuristic as well as the modified single-hub heuristic proposed in Section VII-C. In Figure 2, we show the resulting upper bounds on the RD function based on codebooks of up to $M = 2048$ codewords for $k = 4$ and $k = 30$. Unfortunately, for larger values of M, Step 1 in the Linde-Buzo-Gray algorithm becomes computationally unfeasible. For comparison, Figure 2 also shows the RD function for the corresponding vector setting. It



Fig. 2. Upper bounds on the RD function of a PP of fixed cardinality k (left: $k = 4$; right: $k = 30$) and with $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ following a standard normal distribution. Bound (62) is based on the data-processing inequality and the RD theorem. The other two bounds are based on codebooks, using in the codebook construction the multi-hub heuristic (MH) or the proposed modified single-hub heuristic (MSH). The solid black line is the corresponding vector RD function.

can be seen that the PP setting can significantly reduce the required rates compared to the vector setting. Furthermore, using the significantly less computationally demanding modified single-hub heuristic does not result in increased upper bounds compared to the multi-hub heuristic.

VIII. Poisson Point Processes

The most prominent class of PPs is given by Poisson PPs. These PPs are characterized by a complete randomness property and are widely used in many applications. Formally, a PP X on $\mathbb{R}^d$ is a Poisson PP if it satisfies the following two properties [2, Sec. 2.4]:

1) For any disjoint Borel sets $A, B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the random variables $|\mathsf{X} \cap A|$ and $|\mathsf{X} \cap B|$ are independent, i.e.,
$$\Pr[(|\mathsf{X} \cap A| = k) \wedge (|\mathsf{X} \cap B| = k')] = \Pr[|\mathsf{X} \cap A| = k] \Pr[|\mathsf{X} \cap B| = k']$$
for all $k, k' \in \mathbb{N}_0$.
2) For any Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$, the random variable $|\mathsf{X} \cap A|$ is Poisson distributed with parameter $\lambda(A)$, i.e.,
$$\Pr[|\mathsf{X} \cap A| = k] = \frac{e^{-\lambda(A)} (\lambda(A))^k}{k!} .$$
Here, λ is a measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ (the *intensity measure* of X).

We will assume that X is a finite Poisson PP, which satisfies $\lambda(\mathbb{R}^d) < \infty$. In this setting, we easily obtain the cardinality distribution $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}$ and the measures $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$. Let us express the intensity measure as $\lambda = \nu\lambda_0$, where $\nu \triangleq \lambda(\mathbb{R}^d) \in \mathbb{R}^+$ and $\lambda_0 \triangleq \lambda/\nu$ is a probability measure. We then obtain

$$p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) = \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \qquad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}_0 \tag{63}$$

and

$$P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)} = \lambda_0^k \qquad \text{for } k \in \mathbb{N}\,. \tag{64}$$

Note that (64) implies that for a given cardinality $|\mathsf{X}|$, the vectors $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathsf{X}$ are i.i.d. with probability measure λ_0.

In the following, we will often consider Poisson PPs with intensity measure $\lambda = \nu\lambda_0$, where λ_0 is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathscr{L}^d$ with Radon-Nikodym derivative $g_{\mathsf{X}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_0}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}$. According to (64), this implies that the probability measures $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ are absolutely continuous with respect to $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$ with Radon-Nikodym derivative

$$\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}}{\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} g_{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \tag{65}$$

i.e., the $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ are continuous random vectors with probability density function $\prod_{i=1}^{k} g_{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$.

A. Distortion Function

For a Poisson PP X, there is a nonzero probability that $|X| = k$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$. Thus, for an RD analysis, we have to define a distortion function between point patterns of different cardinalities. We choose the squared OSPA distance [12] (up to a normalization factor[10]). For $X = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_X}\}$ and $Y = \{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_Y}\}$ with $k_X \leq k_Y$, we define the unnormalized squared OSPA (USOSPA) distortion

$$\rho_2(X, Y) \triangleq (k_Y - k_X)\, c^2 + \min_{\tau} \sum_{i=1}^{k_X} \min\left\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau(i)}\|^2, c^2\right\} \tag{66}$$

where $c \in \mathbb{R}^+$ is a parameter (the *cut-off value*) and the outer minimum is taken over all permutations τ of $\{1, \ldots, k_Y\}$. For $k_X > k_Y$, we define $\rho_2(X, Y) \triangleq \rho_2(Y, X)$. According to (66), the USOSPA distortion is constructed by first penalizing the difference in cardinalities via the term $|k_Y - k_X|\, c^2$. Then an optimal assignment between the points of X and Y is established based on the Euclidean distance, and the minima of the squared distances and c^2 are summed. To bound the RD function, we will use the following bounds on the USOSPA distortion, which are proved in Appendix F.

[10] In [12], the OSPA is normalized by the maximal number of points in either pattern. This normalization is unfavorable for our RD analysis as it would cause the distortion, and in turn the RD function, to converge to zero for large patterns.

Lemma 16: Let $X = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_X}\} \in \mathcal{X}$ and $Y = \{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_Y}\} \in \mathcal{X}$. Then

$$\rho_2(X,Y) \geq \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^{k_X} \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\} & \text{if } k_X \geq k_Y \\ (k_Y - k_X)c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k_X} \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\} & \text{if } k_X \leq k_Y\,. \end{cases} \tag{67}$$

B. Lower Bounds for Poisson Point Processes

Based on Theorem 9, we can formulate lower bounds on the RD function of Poisson PPs. A proof of the following result is given in Appendix G.

Theorem 17: Let X be a Poisson PP on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with intensity measure $\lambda = \nu\lambda_0$, where λ_0 is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathscr{L}^d$ with probability density function $g_{\mathsf{X}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_0}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}$. Furthermore, let A be a Borel set satisfying $\int_A g_{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x})\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) = 1$, i.e., $g_{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$ for $\mathscr{L}^d$-almost all $\boldsymbol{x} \in A^c$. Then the RD function of X using distortion ρ_2 is lower-bounded as

$$R(D) \geq \nu\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) + \max_{s \geq 1/c^2} \left(-\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log\left(\min\left\{(\mathscr{L}^d(A))^k, \widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)\right\}\right) - sD \right) \tag{68}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s) \triangleq \left(e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(A) + k\left(-e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \right) \right)^k \tag{69}$$

with $U_c \triangleq \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\boldsymbol{x}\| \leq c\}$.

Note that the PP X enters the bound (68) only via ν and the differential entropy $h(g_{\mathsf{X}})$. In particular, the functions $\widetilde{\gamma}_k$ in (69) do not depend on X. However, they do depend on the set A.

Example 18: Let X be a Poisson PP on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with intensity measure $\lambda = \nu\mathscr{L}^2|_{[0,1)^2}$, i.e., the points are independently and uniformly distributed on the unit square. In this setting, we have $g_{\mathsf{X}} = \mathbb{1}_{[0,1)^2}$ and we can choose $A = [0,1)^2$ in Theorem 17. The differential entropy $h(g_{\mathsf{X}})$ is zero, because the density $g_{\mathsf{X}} = \mathbb{1}_{[0,1)^2}$ takes on the values zero or one. Furthermore, we have $d = 2$ and $\mathscr{L}^2(A) = 1$, and thus (69) reduces to

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\gamma}_k(s) &= \left(e^{-sc^2} + k\left(-\pi c^2 e^{-sc^2} + \frac{\pi}{s}\left(1 - e^{-sc^2}\right)\right)\right)^k \\ &= \left(e^{-sc^2}\left(1 - \pi c^2 k - \frac{\pi k}{s}\right) + \frac{\pi k}{s}\right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

We further obtain

$$\log\left(\min\left\{(\mathscr{L}^2(A))^k, \widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)\right\}\right) = \min\left\{k\log\mathscr{L}^2(A), \log\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)\right\} = \min\{0, \log\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)\}\,.$$



Fig. 3. Lower and upper bounds on the RD function for a Poisson PP with uniform intensity measure $\lambda = 10\mathscr{L}^2|_{[0,1)^2}$ on $[0,1)^2$, using the USOSPA distortion with cutoff value $c = 0.1$.

Thus, we can upper-bound $\log\left(\min\left\{(\mathscr{L}^2(A))^k, \widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)\right\}\right)$ either by zero (which corresponds to omitting the kth summand in (68)) or by $\log\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)$. In particular, we can omit all but the first $k_{\max} \in \mathbb{N}_0$ summands in the lower bound (68) and bound the remaining summands by $\log\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} R(D) &\geq \max_{s \geq 1/c^2} \left(-\sum_{k=1}^{k_{\max}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s) - sD \right) \\ &= \max_{s \geq 1/c^2} \left(-\sum_{k=1}^{k_{\max}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{(k-1)!} \log\left(e^{-sc^2}\left(1 - \pi c^2 k - \frac{\pi k}{s}\right) + \frac{\pi k}{s}\right) - sD \right) \end{aligned} \tag{70}$$

where we used $h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) = 0$. The second derivative of $\log\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)$ is obtained as

$$(\log\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s))'' = \frac{\pi k^2\left((1-\pi c^2 k)(c^4 s^3 - c^2 s^2 - 2se^{-sc^2} + 2s) - c^2 s^2 + e^{-sc^2}\pi k(1-e^{sc^2})^2\right)}{s^2 e^{-sc^2}\left(\pi c^2 k s + \pi k - \pi k e^{sc^2} - s\right)^2}.$$

It can be shown that $(\log\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s))'' > 0$ if $s \geq 3/c^2$ and $k \leq 1/(2\pi c^2)$. Hence, $\log\widetilde{\gamma}_k$ is convex in this case. In particular, for $k \leq k_{\max} \leq 1/(2\pi c^2)$, we have that $\log\widetilde{\gamma}_k$ is a convex function for $s \geq 3/c^2$, and thus the sum on the right-hand side in (70) is—as a sum of concave functions—concave. Thus, if we restrict the maximization in (70) to $s \geq 3/c^2$, we obtain a lower bound for given values of c, $k_{\max} \leq 1/(2\pi c^2)$, ν, and D that we can compute using standard numerical algorithms. In Figure 3, we show this lower bound for $c = 0.1$, $k_{\max} = \lfloor 1/(2\pi c^2)\rfloor = 15$, $\nu = 10$, and various values of D. For $k_{\max} > 1/(2\pi c^2)$, the right-hand side in (70) is not guaranteed to be concave. However, we can still use numerical solvers to try to find local maxima of (70) that give even better results. In particular, we show in Figure 3 also an optimized lower bound for $k_{\max} = 50$.

C. Upper Bound for Poisson Point Processes

Next, we establish an upper bound on the RD function of a Poisson PP X. In the following theorem, which is proven in Appendix H, we apply Theorem 10 to vectors $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ where $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ has the same distribution as $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$.

Theorem 19: Let X be a Poisson PP on $\mathbb{R}^d$ with intensity measure $\lambda = \nu\lambda_0$, where λ_0 is absolutely continuous with respect to $\mathscr{L}^d$ with probability density function $g_{\mathsf{X}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda_0}{\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d}$. Furthermore, let λ_{Y} be a probability measure on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and let $\mathbf{y}^{(k)}$ be random vectors on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ with probability measure $(\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}})^k$ for each $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Define the joint distribution of $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ by a given conditional probability density function $g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})$ on $(\mathbb{R}^d)^k$ for each $\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$. Assume that the resulting random vector $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ has the same distribution as $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ (see (65)), i.e.,

$$\prod_{i=1}^{k} g_{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \tag{71}$$

and that

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \,\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big] \leq D \tag{72}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big]\\ &\quad= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k}\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}), \phi_k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}))\, g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\,.\end{aligned} \tag{73}$$

Then

$$R(D) \leq \nu - \nu\log\nu + \nu\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\big(\log k! - h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big)\big) \tag{74}$$

where

$$h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big) = \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}\big) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \tag{75}$$

with

$$h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}\big) = -\int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\log g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\,. \tag{76}$$

Next, we will use Theorem 19 to construct upper bounds on the RD function of the Poisson PP discussed in Example 18.

Example 20: Let X be a Poisson PP on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with intensity measure $\lambda = \nu\mathscr{L}^2|_{[0,1)^2}$, i.e., $g_{\mathsf{X}} = \mathbb{1}_{[0,1)^2}$. To use Theorem 19, we have to define a measure λ_{Y} and conditional probability density functions $g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})$ such that (71) is satified, i.e., in our case,

$$\int_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{[0,1)^2}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\,. \tag{77}$$

To this end, for $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfying $N \geq 1/(\sqrt{2}c)$ (this condition will be used later), we define λ_{Y} as

$$\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}(C) = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j_1=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2=1}^{N} \delta_{\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1,j_2}}(C) \tag{78}$$

for $C \in \mathcal{B}_2$, where $\delta_{\boldsymbol{x}}$ denotes the point measure at $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1,j_2} = \left(\frac{2j_1-1}{2N}, \frac{2j_2-1}{2N}\right)^{\mathrm{T}}$. Hence, λ_{Y} corresponds to a discrete uniform distribution with the N^2 possible outcomes $\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1,j_2}$ with $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$. Furthermore, consider a set of k index pairs $\left\{\left(j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}\right)\right\}_{i=1,\ldots,k} \subseteq \{1, \ldots, N\}^2$. The function $g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})$ is then defined for $\boldsymbol{y}_i = \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(i)},j_2^{(i)}}$ by

$$g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}\left(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,\middle|\, \left(\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(1)},j_2^{(1)}}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(k)},j_2^{(k)}}\right)\right) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\tau} \prod_{i=1}^{k} N^2 \mathbb{1}_{Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \tag{79}$$

$$= \frac{N^{2k}}{k!} \sum_{\tau} \mathbb{1}_{\prod_{i=1}^{k} Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \tag{80}$$

where $Q_{j_1,j_2} \triangleq \left[-\frac{1}{2N}, \frac{1}{2N}\right)^2 + \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1,j_2}$ and the sum is over all permutations τ of $\{1, \ldots, k\}$. Note that $N^2 \mathbb{1}_{Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}$ is the probability density function of a uniform random vector on the square $Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}$. Thus, the distribution specified by (79) can be interpreted as first randomly choosing an assignment (represented by τ) between $\{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i=1,\ldots,k}$ and $\left\{\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(i)},j_2^{(i)}}\right\}_{i=1,\ldots,k}$, and then distributing $\mathbf{x}_i$ uniformly and independently on the square $Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}$ with center $\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}$.

By Lemma 26 in Appendix I, λ_{Y} defined by (78) and $g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}$ defined by (79) satisfy (77). Furthermore, by Lemma 27 in Appendix I, the left-hand side of (72) is given as

$$\sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \mathbb{E}\left[\rho_2\left(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\right)\right] = \frac{\nu}{6N^2}\,. \tag{81}$$

Thus, condition (72) is satisfied for $D \geq \nu/(6N^2)$ and, in particular, for

$$D = \frac{\nu}{6N^2}\,. \tag{82}$$

Finally, we will simplify the bound (74) for our setting. We first recall that the differential entropy $h(g_{\mathsf{X}})$ is zero (see Example 18). Furthermore, according to Lemma 28 in Appendix I, the conditional differential entropy $h\left(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\middle|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\right)$ can be lower-bounded by

$$h\left(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\middle|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\right) \geq \frac{\binom{N^2}{k} k!}{N^{2k}} \log k! - k \log N^2\,. \tag{83}$$

Inserting $D = \nu/(6N^2)$, $h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) = 0$, and (83) into (74), we obtain

$$R\left(\frac{\nu}{6N^2}\right) \leq \nu - \nu \log \nu + \sum_{k \in \mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\left(\log k! + k \log N^2\right) - \sum_{k=1}^{N^2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k \binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}} \log k! \tag{84}$$

where we used that $\binom{N^2}{k} = 0$ for $k > N^2$ and $\log 0! = 0$. By Lemma 29 in Appendix I with $\widetilde{N} = N$, (84) implies

$$R\Big(\frac{\nu}{6N^2}\Big) \le \nu + \nu \log \frac{N^2}{\nu} + \sum_{k=1}^{N^2} e^{-\nu}\nu^k \log k! \Big(\frac{1}{k!} - \frac{\binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}}\Big) + \Big(1 - \sum_{k=0}^{N^2-2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\Big)\nu^2 \,. \tag{85}$$

The bound (85) can be calculated explicitly for various N. However, for large N, this is computationally intensive. The computational complexity can be reduced by omitting the summands with $k > N_{\max}^2$, where $N_{\max} \le N$, in the last sum in (84), which results in

$$R\Big(\frac{\nu}{6N^2}\Big) \le \nu - \nu \log \nu + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\big(\log k! + k \log N^2\big) - \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\max}^2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k \binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}} \log k! \,. \tag{86}$$

By Lemma 29 in Appendix I with $\widetilde{N} = N_{\max}$, we further obtain

$$R\Big(\frac{\nu}{6N^2}\Big) \le \nu + \nu \log \frac{N^2}{\nu} + \sum_{k=1}^{N_{\max}^2} e^{-\nu}\nu^k \log k! \Big(\frac{1}{k!} - \frac{\binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}}\Big) + \Big(1 - \sum_{k=0}^{N_{\max}^2-2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\Big)\nu^2 \,. \tag{87}$$

In Figure 3, this upper bound is depicted for the case $\nu = 10$, $c = 0.1$, $N_{\max} = \min\{N, 10\}$, and N ranging from 8 to 207 (corresponding to $D = \nu/(6N^2)$ ranging from $3.9 \cdot 10^{-5}$ to $2.6 \cdot 10^{-2}$).

IX. Conclusion

We established lower and upper bounds on the RD function of finite PPs. Our bounds provide insights into the behavior of the RD function and demonstrate that the RD function based on a PP viewpoint can be significantly lower than the RD function based on a vector viewpoint. Furthermore, the PP viewpoint allows sets of different sizes to be considered in a single source coding scenario. Our lower bounds are based on the general RD characterization in [15]. Our upper bounds are based either on the RD theorem or on a concrete source code. In the former case, a combination with the data-processing inequality allowed us to obtain upper bounds based on the mutual information between vectors. In the latter case, we presented some basic constructions of source codes for finite PPs.

To enable a comparison with the vector viewpoint, we considered PPs of fixed cardinality with a specific distortion function. Our choice of this distortion function was motivated by a desire to be consistent with the classical squared error distortion. More specifically, we used an optimal assignment between point patterns in terms of the squared error distortion between points. To obtain upper bounds, we proposed a Lloyd-type algorithm for the construction of source codes. We applied our upper bounds to a PP of fixed cardinality where all points are Gaussian and i.i.d., and we showed that the resulting RD function is significantly smaller than that of a Gaussian vector of the same dimension.

The complexity of our proposed Lloyd-type algorithm does not scale well in the codebook size and the cardinality of the point patterns. An efficient heuristic scheme for computing the "center point pattern"

for a large collection of point patterns would significantly reduce the complexity but does not seem to be available. We note that our algorithm can be easily generalized to PPs of variable cardinality by sorting the collection of point patterns representing the source according to their cardinality and then performing the algorithm for each cardinality separately. However, an algorithm that is able to find center point patterns directly for point patterns of different cardinality may result in better source codes. A first approach in this direction was presented in [27]. Another possible extension of our codebook construction is to consider codewords of length greater than one. This is expected to yield tighter upper bounds, but also to result in a higher computational complexity.

As an example of PPs with variable cardinality, we studied Poisson PPs. We chose an unnormalized squared optimal subpattern assignment (OSPA) distortion function and concretized our bounds. In particular, for a Poisson PP of uniform intensity on the unit square in $\mathbb{R}^2$, our lower and upper bounds are separated only by a small gap and thus provide a good characterization of the RD function. For the construction of the upper bound, we used a uniform quantization. This quantization can also be employed to construct source codes and is a first, simple constructive approach to the generation of source codes for PPs. We expect that—similar to the vector case—finding a good systematic source code construction for general PPs is challenging.

The specific PPs we considered in this paper were only the most basic ones. A large variety of other PPs have been defined in the literature [28, Ch. 3]. In particular, statistical dependencies between the points should result in even lower RD functions but will also require a significantly more complicated analysis. Furthermore, in certain applications, distortion functions that are not based on optimal assignments (e.g., the Hausdorff distance [12]) may be more appropriate and may even result in simpler expressions of the RD function. Finally, we restricted our analysis to memoryless sources, i.e., i.i.d. sequences of PPs. Modeling sources with memory would require mathematical results on random sequences of point patterns (e.g., Markov chains [29, Sec. 7]). An information-theoretic analysis of these sequences is beyond the scope of the present article and appears to be an interesting future research direction.

APPENDIX A
PROPERTIES OF $\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}$

Lemma 21: For $k \in \mathbb{N}$, let ϕ_k be defined as in (1), and for $(k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$, let $\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}$ be defined as in (6)–(8). Then for $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathfrak{S}$, we have

$$\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}) = \begin{cases} \phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}) \times \phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}) & \text{if } k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}} \neq 0 \quad (88a) \\ \phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}) & \text{if } k_{\mathsf{X}} \neq 0, k_{\mathsf{Y}} = 0, \emptyset \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}} \quad (88b) \\ \emptyset & \text{if } k_{\mathsf{X}} \neq 0, k_{\mathsf{Y}} = 0, \emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}} \quad (88c) \\ \phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}) & \text{if } k_{\mathsf{X}} = 0, k_{\mathsf{Y}} \neq 0, \emptyset \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \quad (88d) \\ \emptyset & \text{if } k_{\mathsf{X}} = 0, k_{\mathsf{Y}} \neq 0, \emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}\,. \quad (88e) \end{cases}$$

Proof: Case $k_{\mathsf{X}}, k_{\mathsf{Y}} \neq 0$: According to (6), a vector $(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}})$ belongs to $\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})$ if and only if $\{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}\} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}$ and $\{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}\} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}$. By (1), this in turn is equivalent to $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}} \in \phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}})$ and $\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}} \in \phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})$. This proves (88a).

Case $k_{\mathsf{X}} \neq 0, k_{\mathsf{Y}} = 0, \emptyset \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}$: According to (8), a vector $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}$ belongs to $\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},0}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})$ if and only if $\{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}\} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}$ and $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}$. As we assumed $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}$, this is, by (1), equivalent to $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}} \in \phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}})$. This proves (88b).

Case $k_{\mathsf{X}} \neq 0, k_{\mathsf{Y}} = 0, \emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}$: According to (8), a vector $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}$ belongs to $\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},0}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})$ if and only if $\{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}\} \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}$ and $\emptyset \in \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}$. Because we assumed $\emptyset \notin \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}$, there is no $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}$ that belongs to $\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},0}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})$. This proves (88c).

The remaining cases, (88d) and (88e), follow by symmetry. ■

Lemma 22: Let $A \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}+k_{\mathsf{Y}}}$. Then

$$\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)) = \bigcup_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}} \psi_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A) \tag{89}$$

where $\psi_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}}$ is given by (12), and the union is over all permutations τ_{X} and τ_{Y} on $\{1, \ldots, k_{\mathsf{X}}\}$ and $\{1, \ldots, k_{\mathsf{Y}}\}$, respectively.

Proof: We first show $\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)) \subseteq \bigcup_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}} \psi_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)$. To this end, let

$$(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \in \phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A))\,. \tag{90}$$

We have to show that $(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \in \psi_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)$ for some permutations $\tau_{\mathsf{X}}, \tau_{\mathsf{Y}}$. By the definition of the inverse image, (90) implies that $\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}})$ belongs to $\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)$. This does not necessarily imply $(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \in A$ but there must exist a vector $(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \in A$ such that $\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) = \phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}})$, i.e., $(\{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}\}, \{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}\}) = (\{\boldsymbol{x}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{x}_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}\}, \{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}\})$. This equality implies that there exist permutations τ_{X} and τ_{Y} such that $(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) = (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}}(1)}, \ldots, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}}(k_{\mathsf{X}})}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}(1)}, \ldots, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})})$, i.e., $(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \in \psi_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)$.

It remains to show $\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)) \supseteq \bigcup_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}} \psi_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)$ or, equivalently, $\phi^{-1}_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)) \supseteq \psi_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)$ for all permutations τ_{X} and τ_{Y}. To this end, let $(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \in \psi_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}},\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}}(A)$. Thus, $(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) = (\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}}(1)}, \ldots, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{\tau_{\mathsf{X}}(k_{\mathsf{X}})}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}(1)}, \ldots, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{\tau_{\mathsf{Y}}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})})$ for some $(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \in A$. In particular, this equality implies that

$(\{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_1,\ldots,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{k_\mathsf{X}}\},\{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_1,\ldots,\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}\})=(\{\boldsymbol{x}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{x}_{k_\mathsf{X}}\},\{\boldsymbol{y}_1,\ldots,\boldsymbol{y}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}\})$, or, equivalently, $\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}},\widetilde{\boldsymbol{y}}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}})=\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}},\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}})$. The latter equality implies $(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}},\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}})\in\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A))$. ■

APPENDIX B
PROOF OF LEMMA 3

We first present a preliminary result.

Lemma 23: Let (X,Y) be a pair of PPs. For $\mathcal{A}\in\mathfrak{S}\otimes\mathfrak{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}P_\mathsf{X}\times P_\mathsf{Y}(\mathcal{A})&=p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\emptyset,\emptyset)\big)\\&\quad+\sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},0}(\mathcal{A})\big)\\&\quad+\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{0,k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A})\big)\\&\quad+\sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A})\big)\,.\end{aligned}\tag{91}$$

Proof: We first note that both sides of (91) are measures on $\mathfrak{S}\otimes\mathfrak{S}$. Thus, it suffices to show that (91) holds on all rectangles $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}$ with $\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X},\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathfrak{S}$, as the extension to all of $\mathfrak{S}\otimes\mathfrak{S}$ is unique. For $\mathcal{A}=\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}$ with $\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X},\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathfrak{S}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}P_\mathsf{X}\times P_\mathsf{Y}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})&=P_\mathsf{X}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})P_\mathsf{Y}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\\&\overset{(3)}{=}\left(p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}}(\emptyset)+\sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})\big)\right)\\&\quad\times\left(p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset)+\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big)\right)\\&=p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}}(\emptyset)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset)\\&\quad+p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset)\sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})\big)\\&\quad+p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}}(\emptyset)\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big)\\&\quad+\sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})\big)P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big)\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\overset{(a)}{=} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}\big((\emptyset,\emptyset)\big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},0}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{0,k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big)
\end{aligned}
$$

where (a) holds because

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset)P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})\big) &\overset{\text{(88b),(88c)}}{=} P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},0}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big)\,, \\
\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}}(\emptyset)P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big) &\overset{\text{(88d),(88e)}}{=} P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{0,k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big)
\end{aligned}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})\big)P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big) &= P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})\times\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big) \\
&\overset{\text{(88a)}}{=} P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})\big)\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows that (91) holds for all rectangles and thus concludes the proof. ■

B.1 Equivalence of (i) and (ii)

Next, we show that properties (i) and (ii) in Lemma 3 are equivalent.

(i) ⇒ (ii): We first assume that (i) holds, i.e., $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}} \ll P_\mathsf{X}\times P_\mathsf{Y}$. We want to show that this implies (ii). To this end, let $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}(A) = 0$ for $k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}$ with $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})\neq 0$ and a Borel set $A\subseteq(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_\mathsf{X}+k_\mathsf{Y}}$. Because $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}$ and $P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$ are symmetric measures, this implies (cf. (13)) $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\psi_{\tau_\mathsf{X},\tau_\mathsf{Y}}(A)\big) = 0$ for all permutations $\tau_\mathsf{X},\tau_\mathsf{Y}$. By (89), this implies

$$
P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A))\big) = 0\,. \tag{92}
$$

Because $\phi_{k'_\mathsf{X},k'_\mathsf{Y}}$ and $\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}$ have disjoint images for $(k'_\mathsf{X},k'_\mathsf{Y})\neq(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})$, we obtain $\phi_{k'_\mathsf{X},k'_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A)) = \emptyset$, which implies

$$
\begin{aligned}
P_\mathsf{X}^{(k'_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k'_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{k'_\mathsf{X},k'_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A))\big) &= 0 \qquad k'_\mathsf{X},k'_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N} && \text{(93a)}\\
P_\mathsf{X}^{(k'_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi_{k'_\mathsf{X},0}^{-1}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A))\big) &= 0 \qquad k'_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N} && \text{(93b)}\\
P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k'_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi_{0,k'_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A))\big) &= 0 \qquad k'_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}\,. && \text{(93c)}
\end{aligned}
$$

Furthermore, $(\emptyset,\emptyset)\notin\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A)$ and thus

$$
\mathbb{1}_{\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A)}\big((\emptyset,\emptyset)\big) = 0\,. \tag{93d}
$$

By (91) with $\mathcal{A} = \phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A)$, (92) and (93) imply $P_\mathsf{X} \times P_\mathsf{Y}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A)) = 0$. Due to the assumed absolute continuity $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}} \ll P_\mathsf{X} \times P_\mathsf{Y}$, this implies $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A)) = 0$ and in turn, by (10) with $\mathcal{A} = \phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A)$, $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A))\big) = 0$ (recall that we assumed $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$). Because $A \subseteq \phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(A))$, we obtain $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}(A) = 0$. Thus, we showed that for $k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N}$ with $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$, $P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})} \times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}(A) = 0$ implies $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}(A) = 0$, i.e., we have $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})} \ll P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})} \times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$. If $k_\mathsf{X} = 0$ or $k_\mathsf{Y} = 0$, the proof follows analogously.

(ii) $\Rightarrow$ (i): For the converse direction, we assume that (ii) holds, i.e., for all $k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$, we have $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})} \ll P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})} \times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$; for all $k_\mathsf{X} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},0) \neq 0$, we have $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},0)} \ll P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}$; and for all $k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$, we have $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_\mathsf{Y})} \ll P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$. In order to show (i), assume that $P_\mathsf{X} \times P_\mathsf{Y}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ for $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{S} \otimes \mathfrak{S}$. By (91), this implies

$$p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_\mathcal{A}((\emptyset,\emptyset)) = 0 \tag{94a}$$

$$P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},0}(\mathcal{A})\big) = 0 \qquad \text{if } k_\mathsf{X} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0) \neq 0 \tag{94b}$$

$$P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{0,k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A})\big) = 0 \qquad \text{if } k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0 \tag{94c}$$

$$P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})} \times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A})\big) = 0 \qquad \text{if } k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0\,. \tag{94d}$$

By (15), we have that for any $(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2$, both $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})$ and $p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})$ are nonzero if $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$. Thus, the conditions in (94) are implied by corresponding conditions on $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})$ and we obtain

$$p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)\mathbb{1}_\mathcal{A}((\emptyset,\emptyset)) = 0$$

$$P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},0}(\mathcal{A})\big) = 0 \qquad \text{if } k_\mathsf{X} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},0) \neq 0$$

$$P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{0,k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A})\big) = 0 \qquad \text{if } k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$$

$$P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})} \times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A})\big) = 0 \qquad \text{if } k_\mathsf{X}, k_\mathsf{Y} \in \mathbb{N} \text{ and } p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0\,.$$

By the absolute continuity assumptions in (ii), this implies $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}\big(\phi^{-1}_{k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A})\big) = 0$ for any $(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}$ with $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y}) \neq 0$. Thus, all summands on the right-hand side of (10) are zero, which implies $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$. Hence, we showed that $P_\mathsf{X} \times P_\mathsf{Y}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$ implies $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}) = 0$, i.e., $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}} \ll P_\mathsf{X} \times P_\mathsf{Y}$, which is (i).

B.2 Proof that $\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}}{\mathrm{d}(P_\mathsf{X} \times P_\mathsf{Y})} = \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$

We have to show that for all $\mathcal{A} \in \mathfrak{S} \otimes \mathfrak{S}$

$$P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}) = \int_\mathcal{A} \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)\,\mathrm{d}(P_\mathsf{X} \times P_\mathsf{Y})(X,Y)\,. \tag{95}$$

Because finite measures can be uniquely extended to a product σ-algebra based on their values on rectangles, it suffices to consider sets $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}$ with $\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}, \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathfrak{S}$. With this choice, it follows from (10) that the left-hand side in (95) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}) &= p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}}\big((\emptyset,\emptyset)\big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})\big) \\
&\overset{(88)}{=} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}}(\emptyset)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\emptyset) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\emptyset) \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},0) P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}\big(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}})\big) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}}(\emptyset) \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}}) P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})\big) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}) \times \phi_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})\big)\,. \qquad (96)
\end{aligned}$$

The right-hand side in (95) can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}} \times \mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}} \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)\,\mathrm{d}(P_{\mathsf{X}} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}})(X,Y) \\
&= \int_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}} \int_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}} \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}(X)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}(Y) \\
&\overset{(a)}{=} \int_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}} \left(p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}}(\emptyset)\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset,Y) + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) \int_{\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}})} \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}),Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) \right) \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}(Y) \\
&= p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}}(\emptyset) \int_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}} \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset,Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}(Y) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) \int_{\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}})} \int_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}} \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}),Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}(Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) \\
&\overset{(b)}{=} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}}}(\emptyset) \Bigg(p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\emptyset)\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset,\emptyset) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \int_{\phi_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})} \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset,\phi_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}))\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \Bigg) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) \int_{\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{X}})} \Bigg(p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\emptyset)\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}),\emptyset) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \int_{\phi_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_{\mathsf{Y}})} \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}),\phi_{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}))\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \Bigg) \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}})
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}}(\emptyset)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset)\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset,\emptyset) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}}(\emptyset)\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}\int_{\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0)p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y})\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset,\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}}))\,\mathrm{d}P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}}) \\
&\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset)\sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}\int_{\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}}),\emptyset)\,\mathrm{d}P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}\int_{\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})}\int_{\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_\mathsf{X})p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{Y}) \\
&\quad \times \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}}),\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}}))\,\mathrm{d}P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}})\,\mathrm{d}P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}}) \qquad (97)
\end{aligned}
$$

where we used (5) with $\widetilde{g}(X)=\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)$ in (a), and (5) once with $\widetilde{g}(Y)=\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset,Y)$ and once with $\widetilde{g}(Y)=\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}}),Y)$ in (b). Inserting (23) into (97), we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}\times\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)\,\mathrm{d}(P_\mathsf{X}\times P_\mathsf{Y})(X,Y) \\
&\qquad = p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}}(\emptyset)\mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset) \\
&\qquad\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X}}(\emptyset)\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}\int_{\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,k_\mathsf{Y})\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_\mathsf{Y})}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}}) \\
&\qquad\quad + \mathbb{1}_{\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset)\sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}\int_{\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},0)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},0)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}}) \\
&\qquad\quad + \sum_{k_\mathsf{X}\in\mathbb{N}}\sum_{k_\mathsf{Y}\in\mathbb{N}}\int_{\phi_{k_\mathsf{X}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{X})\times\phi_{k_\mathsf{Y}}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}_\mathsf{Y})} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_\mathsf{X}},\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_\mathsf{Y}})\,.
\end{aligned}
$$

This is seen to coincide with (96), and thus the equality (95) holds.

APPENDIX C
PROOF OF THEOREM 4

We first note that due to the equivalence of (i) and (ii) in Lemma 3, $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}} \ll P_\mathsf{X}\times P_\mathsf{Y}$ if and only if $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},0)} \ll P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}$, $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_\mathsf{Y})} \ll P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$, and $P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})} \ll P_\mathsf{X}^{(k_\mathsf{X})}\times P_\mathsf{Y}^{(k_\mathsf{Y})}$ for all $(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})\in\mathbb{N}_0^2\setminus\{(0,0)\}$ with $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_\mathsf{X},k_\mathsf{Y})\neq 0$. Thus, if any of the aforementioned absolute continuities do not hold, (21) and (22) imply that both sides in (24) are infinite, which concludes the proof for this case. Otherwise, (i) and (ii) in Lemma 3 hold and we can express the mutual information and all relevant Kullback-Leibler divergences in (24) using Radon-Nikodym derivatives. We recall from Lemma 3 that in this case $\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}}{\mathrm{d}(P_\mathsf{X}\times P_\mathsf{Y})}(X,Y)=\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)$ where $\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ satisfies (23). Thus, using (21), we obtain

$$
I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) = \int_{\mathcal{X}^2}\log\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)\,\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)\,.
$$

Using (11) with $g(X,Y) = \log \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(X,Y)$, we obtain further

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) = p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0) \log \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}(\emptyset,\emptyset) + \sum_{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \in \mathbb{N}_0^2 \setminus \{(0,0)\}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \times \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}+k_{\mathsf{Y}}}} \log \theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}\big(\phi_{k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}})\big) \, \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \, .$$

Inserting for $\theta_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}$ the expressions (23) yields

$$\begin{aligned}
I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) &= p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0) \log \left(\frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,0)}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},0) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}}} \log \left(\frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(0)} \frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}}{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) \right) \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}} \log \left(\frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(0) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \right) \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}+k_{\mathsf{Y}}}} \log \left(\frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}{\mathrm{d}\big(P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \right) \\
&\quad \times \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \\
&= \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}_0} \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}_0} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \log \left(\frac{p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}{p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}}) p_{|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{Y}})} \right) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},0) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}}} \log \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}}{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) \right) \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},0)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{Y}}}} \log \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \right) \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(0,k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \\
&\quad + \sum_{k_{\mathsf{X}} \in \mathbb{N}} \sum_{k_{\mathsf{Y}} \in \mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^{k_{\mathsf{X}}+k_{\mathsf{Y}}}} \log \left(\frac{\mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}}{\mathrm{d}\big(P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}})} \times P_{\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{Y}})}\big)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \right) \\
&\quad \times \mathrm{d}P_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}})}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k_{\mathsf{X}}}, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k_{\mathsf{Y}}}) \, .
\end{aligned}$$

The result (24) now follows by using (20) and (22).

APPENDIX D
PROOF OF THEOREM 10

Based on the random vectors $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$, we can extend X to a pair of PPs (X,Y) of equal cardinality. We define the cardinality distribution of (X,Y) as $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k_{\mathsf{X}},k_{\mathsf{Y}}) = 0$ for $k_{\mathsf{X}} \neq k_{\mathsf{Y}}$ and $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k) = p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ and set

$$(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)} = (\mathbf{x}_{\mathrm{sym}}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}_{\mathrm{sym}}^{(k)}) \tag{98}$$

where $(\mathbf{x}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)})$ is a symmetric version of $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ (this can be easily constructed by first choosing uniformly random permutations $\tau_{\mathbf{x}}$ and $\tau_{\mathbf{y}}$ independently of all other random variables and then setting $(\mathbf{x}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}) = \psi_{\tau_{\mathbf{x}},\tau_{\mathbf{y}}}(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ where $\psi_{\tau_{\mathbf{x}},\tau_{\mathbf{y}}}$ was defined in (12)). Because the value of ϕ_k does not change if we permute the input, we obtain

$$\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)})\big) = \big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\,. \tag{99}$$

By (18) and (98), we further have

$$\phi_{k,k}\big((\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})_{\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y}}^{(k,k)}\big) = \big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\,. \tag{100}$$

Recall that we assumed that $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ and $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)})$ have the same distribution, and thus $p_{|\mathsf{X}|,|\mathsf{Y}|}(k,k) = p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)$ and (100) imply that the marginal of (X,Y) indeed has the same distribution as X. By Corollary 7, the mutual information between X and Y is

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) = H(|\mathsf{X}|) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\, I\big(\mathbf{x}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}\big)\,. \tag{101}$$

Corollary 5 applied to the pair of PPs $\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)$ implies

$$I\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}); \phi_k(\mathbf{y}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)})\big) = I\big(\mathbf{x}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}\big)$$

and, by (99),

$$I\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}); \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big) = I\big(\mathbf{x}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}\big)\,. \tag{102}$$

Inserting (102) into (101), we obtain

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) = H(|\mathsf{X}|) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\, I\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}); \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\,. \tag{103}$$

By Lemma 6, we have

$$I\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}); \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big) \le I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big)\,. \tag{104}$$

Combining (103) and (104), we obtain

$$I(\mathsf{X};\mathsf{Y}) \le H(|\mathsf{X}|) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\, I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big)$$

which, due to (25), implies (38) provided that the constructed pair of PPs (X,Y) satisfies $\mathbb{E}[\rho(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y})] \le D$. This latter inequality is shown as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}[\rho(\mathsf{X},\mathsf{Y})] &\overset{(a)}{=} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\, \mathbb{E}\big[\rho\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}_{\text{sym}}^{(k)})\big)\big] \\
&\overset{(99)}{=} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\, \mathbb{E}\big[\rho\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big] \\
&\overset{(37)}{\le} D
\end{aligned}$$

where (a) holds due to (19) and because $\rho(\emptyset,\emptyset) = 0$.

APPENDIX E
PROOF OF LEMMA 15

We have to show that X_j^* as defined in (51), (52) satisfies $\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\rho_2(X,X_j^*)\leq\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\rho_2(X,\widetilde{X})$ for all $\widetilde{X}\in\mathcal{X}_k$. To this end, we first construct an upper bound on $\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\rho_2(X,X_j^*)$ based on (52). According to (52), the collection of permutations $\{\tau_X^*\}_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}$ satisfies

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{A}_j|}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X^*(i)}^{(X)}-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}^*(i)}^{(X')}\big\|^2=\min_{\{\tau_X\}_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{A}_j|}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big\|^2. \quad (105)$$

Setting

$$\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\triangleq\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}\qquad\text{for } i\in\{1,\dots,k\} \quad (106)$$

we can rewrite the two inner sums on the right-hand side of (105) according to

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big\|^2\\
&\quad=\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\big(\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\big)+\big(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big)\big\|^2\\
&\quad=\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\Big(\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\big\|^2+2\big(\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\big)^{\mathrm{T}}\big(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big)+\big\|\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big\|^2\Big)\\
&\quad=\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\big\|^2+\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big(\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\big)^{\mathrm{T}}\big(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big)\\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big\|^2\\
&\quad=\frac{1}{2}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\big\|^2+\Bigg(\underbrace{\Bigg(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}\Bigg)-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i}_{\mathbf{0}}\Bigg)^{\mathrm{T}}\Bigg(\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big(\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big)\Bigg)\\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{2}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}(i)}^{(X')}\big\|^2\\
&\quad=\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\big\|^2. \qquad (107)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, using $\boldsymbol{x}_i^*=\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X^*(i)}^{(X)}$ (cf. (51)), we can rewrite the two inner sums on the left-hand side of (105) according to

$$\frac{1}{2|\mathcal{A}_j|}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\sum_{X'\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X^*(i)}^{(X)}-\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X'}^*(i)}^{(X')}\big\|^2=\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X^*(i)}^{(X)}-\boldsymbol{x}_i^*\big\|^2. \quad (108)$$

Inserting (107) and (108) into (105) for all $i\in\{1,\dots,k\}$ yields

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X^*(i)}^{(X)}-\boldsymbol{x}_i^*\big\|^2=\min_{\{\tau_X\}_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}}\sum_{i=1}^{k}\sum_{X\in\mathcal{A}_j}\big\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)}-\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i\big\|^2. \quad (109)$$

Let us recall (43) in our setting, i.e.,

$$\rho_2(X, X_j^*) = \min_{\tau_X} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^* \right\|^2$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, X_j^*) &= \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \min_{\tau_X} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^* \right\|^2 \\
&\leq \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X^*(i)}^{(X)} - \boldsymbol{x}_i^* \right\|^2 \\
&\overset{(109)}{=} \min_{\{\tau_X\}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j}} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right\|^2 . \qquad (110)
\end{aligned}$$

We next want to relate the upper bound (110) on $\sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, X_j^*)$ to $\sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, \widetilde{X})$ for an arbitrary $\widetilde{X} = \{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_k\} \in \mathcal{X}_k$. For any permutations $\{\tau_X\}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j}$ and vector $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$, the sum $\sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right\|^2$ is a sum of squared error distortions of kd-dimensional vectors. The minimum of that sum with respect to $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k}$ is easily seen to be achieved by the arithmetic mean of $\left\{ \left((\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(1)}^{(X)})^{\mathrm{T}} \; \cdots \; (\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(k)}^{(X)})^{\mathrm{T}} \right)^{\mathrm{T}} \right\}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j}$, i.e., by $\bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k}$ (cf. (106)). Thus, we obtain for any $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{k} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \bar{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right\|^2 \leq \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right\|^2 . \qquad (111)$$

Using (111) in (110), we have for any $\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_{1:k} \in (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$

$$\sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, X_j^*) \leq \min_{\{\tau_X\}_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j}} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right\|^2 . \qquad (112)$$

Because each summand $\sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right\|^2$ on the right-hand side of (112) depends only on one permutation τ_X, we can exchange the outer sum and the minimization and obtain

$$\sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, X_j^*) \leq \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \min_{\tau_X} \sum_{i=1}^{k} \left\| \boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_X(i)}^{(X)} - \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_i \right\|^2 . \qquad (113)$$

According to (43), the right-hand side of (113) is equal to $\sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, \widetilde{X})$ for $\widetilde{X} = \{\widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_1, \ldots, \widetilde{\boldsymbol{x}}_k\}$. Thus, we have

$$\sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, X_j^*) \leq \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, \widetilde{X})$$

for any set $\widetilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}_k$. This proves that $X_j^* = \arg\min_{\widetilde{X} \in \mathcal{X}_k} \sum_{X \in \mathcal{A}_j} \rho_2(X, \widetilde{X})$.

APPENDIX F
PROOF OF LEMMA 16

Case $k_X \geq k_Y$: According to (66), we have

$$\rho_2(X,Y) = (k_X - k_Y)\, c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_i\right\|^2, c^2\right\} \tag{114}$$

where $\tau_{X,Y}$ denotes the minimizing permutation. Representing the product $(k_X - k_Y)\, c^2$ as a sum, we can rewrite (114) as

$$\rho_2(X,Y) = \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_i\right\|^2, c^2\right\} + \sum_{i=k_Y+1}^{k_X} c^2\,. \tag{115}$$

We proceed by bounding each summand in (115) for $i \in \{1,\dots,k_X\}$. For $i \in \{1,\dots,k_Y\}$, we have

$$\min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_i\right\|^2, c^2\right\} = \min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau_{X,Y}^{-1}(\tau_{X,Y}(i))}\right\|^2, c^2\right\} \geq \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_j\right\|^2, c^2\right\}. \tag{116}$$

For the remaining $i \in \{k_Y+1,\dots,k_X\}$, we have trivially

$$c^2 \geq \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_j\right\|^2, c^2\right\}. \tag{117}$$

Inserting (116) and (117) into (115), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_2(X,Y) &\geq \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_j\right\|^2, c^2\right\} + \sum_{i=k_Y+1}^{k_X} \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_j\right\|^2, c^2\right\} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{k_X} \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\left\{\left\|\boldsymbol{x}_{\tau_{X,Y}(i)} - \boldsymbol{y}_j\right\|^2, c^2\right\}\end{aligned}$$

which, due to the bijectivity of $\tau_{X,Y}$, is equivalent to the first inequality in (67).

Case $k_X \leq k_Y$: Inserting $\|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_{\tau(i)}\|^2 \geq \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2$ into (66) yields

$$\rho_2(X,Y) \geq (k_Y - k_X)\, c^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{k_X} \min\left\{\min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\right\}$$

which is equivalent to the second inequality in (67).

APPENDIX G
PROOF OF THEOREM 17

According to (65) and the discussion preceding it, the probability measures $P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ are absolutely continuous with respect to $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$ with probability density function $f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = \prod_{i=1}^k g_{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$. Furthermore,

by the assumption $g_{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}) = 0$ for $\mathscr{L}^d$-almost all $\boldsymbol{x} \in A^c$, we obtain $f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = 0$ for $(\mathscr{L}^d)^k$-almost all $\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \in (A^k)^c$. Hence, the conditions in Theorem 9 are satisfied, and we can rewrite the bound (32) as

$$\begin{aligned} R(D) &\geq \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) h(f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}) + \max_{s\geq 0} \Big(- \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) \log \gamma_k(s) - sD \Big) \\ &\overset{(a)}{=} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} k\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) + \max_{s\geq 0} \Big(- \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log \gamma_k(s) - sD \Big) \\ &= \nu\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) + \max_{s\geq 0} \Big(- \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log \gamma_k(s) - sD \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{118}$$

where (a) holds due to (63) and $h(f_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}) = k\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}})$. The functions $\gamma_k(s)$ in (118) have to satisfy[11] (cf. (33))

$$\gamma_k(s) \geq \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } k = 0 \\ \int_{A^k} e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)}\, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) & \text{if } k \in \mathbb{N} \end{cases} \tag{119}$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{X}$. The constant functions $\gamma_k(s) = (\mathscr{L}^d(A))^k$ satisfy (119) because

$$\gamma_k(s) = (\mathscr{L}^d(A))^k = (\mathscr{L}^d)^k(A^k) = \int_{A^k} 1\, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \geq \int_{A^k} e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)}\, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \tag{120}$$

for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\gamma_0(s) = 1$ for $k = 0$. The following lemma, proved further below, states that also the functions $\widetilde{\gamma}_k$ defined in (69) satisfy (119).

Lemma 24: Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Borel set and $s \geq 1/c^2$. Then (119) holds for

$$\gamma_k(s) = \widetilde{\gamma}_k(s) = \left(e^{-sc^2} \mathscr{L}^d(A) + k \Big(- e^{-sc^2} \mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \Big) \right)^k . \tag{121}$$

By Lemma 24 and (120), we obtain that (118) holds with $\gamma_k(s) = \min\{(\mathscr{L}^d(A))^k, \widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)\}$ if we additionally restrict the maximization to $s \geq 1/c^2$. But with these modifications, (118) is equal to (68) up to the summand for $k = 0$, which is zero because $\min\{(\mathscr{L}^d(A))^0, \widetilde{\gamma}_0(s)\} = 1$. Therefore, (68) has been proved.

It remains to prove Lemma 24. To this end, we will need the following technical result.

Lemma 25: Let $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ be a Borel set, $s > 0$, and $c > 0$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_A \exp\Big(- s \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\} \Big)\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \\ &\qquad \leq e^{-sc^2} \mathscr{L}^d(A) + k_Y \Big(- e^{-sc^2} \mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \Big) \end{aligned} \tag{122}$$

for any point pattern $Y = \{\boldsymbol{y}_1, \ldots, \boldsymbol{y}_{k_Y}\}$.

[11]For $k = 0$, (33) gives $\gamma_0(s) \geq e^{-s\rho_2(\emptyset,Y)}$. If $Y = \emptyset$, this simplifies to $\gamma_0(s) \geq 1$ because $\rho_2(\emptyset,\emptyset) = 0$. For all other $Y \in \mathcal{X}$, we trivially have $e^{-s\rho_2(\emptyset,Y)} \leq 1$.

Proof: For $\boldsymbol{x} \in A$,

$$\min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\} = \begin{cases} \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_i\|^2 & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in B_i \\ c^2 & \text{if } \boldsymbol{x} \in A \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_Y} B_i \end{cases} \tag{123}$$

where $B_i \subseteq A$, $i \in \{1,\dots,k_Y\}$ is given by

$$B_i \triangleq \left\{\boldsymbol{x} \in A : \big(\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_i\| \le c\big) \wedge \big(\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_i\| \le \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_j\| \; \forall j \in \{1,\dots,k_Y\} \setminus \{i\}\big)\right\}.$$

The sets B_i, $i \in \{1,\dots,k_Y\}$ and $A \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_Y} B_i$ cover the set A and, thus, we can bound the integral on the left-hand side of (122) by a sum of integrals as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_A \exp\Big(-s \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\}\Big)\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&\qquad \le \int_{A\setminus\bigcup_{i=1}^{k_Y} B_i} \exp\Big(-s \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\}\Big)\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&\qquad\quad + \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \int_{B_i} \exp\Big(-s \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\}\Big)\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&\qquad \overset{(123)}{=} \int_{A\setminus\bigcup_{i=1}^{k_Y} B_i} e^{-sc^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) + \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \int_{B_i} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_i\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&\qquad = e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d\Big(A \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_Y} B_i\Big) + \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \int_{B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}).
\end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

We have $B_i \subseteq \big\{\boldsymbol{x} \in A : \|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_i\| \le c\big\}$ and hence $B_i - \boldsymbol{y}_i \subseteq \big\{\boldsymbol{x} \in (A-\boldsymbol{y}_i) : \|\boldsymbol{x}\| \le c\big\} \subseteq \{\boldsymbol{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d : \|\boldsymbol{x}\| \le c\} = U_c$; furthermore, $e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2} \ge e^{-sc^2}$ for all $\boldsymbol{x} \in U_c$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&\qquad \overset{(a)}{=} \int_{B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) + \int_{U_c\setminus(B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i)} e^{-sc^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d\big(U_c \setminus (B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i)\big) \\
&\qquad \le \int_{B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) + \int_{U_c\setminus(B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i)} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d\big(U_c \setminus (B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i)\big) \\
&\qquad = \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) - e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d\big(U_c \setminus (B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i)\big)
\end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

where in (a) we added and subtracted $e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d\big(U_c \setminus (B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i)\big)$. Inserting (125) into (124), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_A \exp\Big(-s \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\}\Big)\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&\qquad \le e^{-sc^2}\left(\mathscr{L}^d\Big(A \setminus \bigcup_{i=1}^{k_Y} B_i\Big) - \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \mathscr{L}^d\big(U_c \setminus (B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i)\big)\right) + k_Y \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x}) \\
&\qquad \overset{(a)}{=} e^{-sc^2}\left(\mathscr{L}^d(A) - \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \mathscr{L}^d(B_i) - \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y} \big(\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) - \mathscr{L}^d(B_i)\big)\right) + k_Y \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})
\end{aligned}$$

$$= e^{-sc^2}\big(\mathscr{L}^d(A) - k_Y\mathscr{L}^d(U_c)\big) + k_Y\int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})$$
$$= e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(A) + k_Y\bigg(-e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})\bigg)$$

where in (a) we used $\mathscr{L}^d\big(A\setminus\bigcup_{i=1}^{k_Y}B_i\big) = \mathscr{L}^d(A) - \sum_{i=1}^{k_Y}\mathscr{L}^d(B_i)$ and $\mathscr{L}^d(U_c\setminus(B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i)) = \mathscr{L}^d(U_c) - \mathscr{L}^d(B_i-\boldsymbol{y}_i) = \mathscr{L}^d(U_c) - \mathscr{L}^d(B_i)$. ■

Proof of Lemma 24: We first note that $\widetilde{\gamma}_0(s) = 1$ and thus in the case $k = 0$, (119) is trivially satisfied. It remains to show that for $k \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s) \geq \int_{A^k} e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)}\,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \tag{126}$$

for all $Y \in \mathcal{X}$. To this end, we set $Y = \{\boldsymbol{y}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{y}_{k_Y}\}$ and consider the cases $k_Y \leq k$ and $k_Y > k$ separately.

Case $k_Y \leq k$: Because $\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = \{\boldsymbol{x}_1,\dots,\boldsymbol{x}_k\}$, we have

$$e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)} \overset{(67)}{\leq} \exp\bigg(-s\sum_{i=1}^{k}\min_{j=1}^{k_Y}\min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2,c^2\}\bigg)$$
$$= \prod_{i=1}^{k}\exp\Big(-s\min_{j=1}^{k_Y}\min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2,c^2\}\Big). \tag{127}$$

Using (127), we can bound the integral on the right-hand side of (126) as follows:

$$\int_{A^k} e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)}\,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$
$$\leq \int_{A^k}\prod_{i=1}^{k}\exp\Big(-s\min_{j=1}^{k_Y}\min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2,c^2\}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$
$$= \bigg(\int_A \exp\Big(-s\min_{j=1}^{k_Y}\min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2,c^2\}\Big)\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})\bigg)^k$$
$$\overset{(122)}{\leq}\bigg(e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(A) + k_Y\bigg(-e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})\bigg)\bigg)^k. \tag{128}$$

Because $\|\boldsymbol{x}\| \leq c$ for $\boldsymbol{x} \in U_c$, we have $e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) \leq \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})$ and hence the right-hand side in (128) is monotonically increasing in k_Y. Thus, due to $k_Y \leq k$, we can further upper-bound (128) according to

$$\int_{A^k} e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)}\,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \leq \bigg(e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(A) + k\bigg(-e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2}\,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})\bigg)\bigg)^k$$
$$\overset{(121)}{=}\widetilde{\gamma}_k(s)$$

which is (126).

Case $k_Y > k$: We have

$$e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)} \overset{(67)}{\leq} e^{-sc^2(k_Y-k)} \exp\Big(- s \sum_{i=1}^{k} \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\}\Big)$$
$$= e^{-sc^2(k_Y-k)} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \exp\Big(- s \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\}\Big).$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\int_{A^k} e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$
$$\leq e^{-sc^2(k_Y-k)} \int_{A^k} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \exp\Big(- s \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x}_i - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\}\Big) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$
$$= e^{-sc^2(k_Y-k)} \bigg(\int_{A} \exp\Big(- s \min_{j=1}^{k_Y} \min\{\|\boldsymbol{x} - \boldsymbol{y}_j\|^2, c^2\}\Big) \,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})\bigg)^k$$
$$\overset{(122)}{\leq} e^{-sc^2(k_Y-k)} \bigg(e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(A) + k_Y \Big(- e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2} \,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})\Big)\bigg)^k$$
$$= \bigg(e^{-sc^2 k_Y/k}\mathscr{L}^d(A) + e^{-sc^2(k_Y-k)/k} \, k_Y \Big(- e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2} \,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})\Big)\bigg)^k. \quad (129)$$

It is straightforward to show that for $sc^2 \geq 1$, the functions $e^{-sc^2 k_Y/k}$ and $e^{-sc^2(k_Y-k)/k} k_Y$ are monotonically decreasing in k_Y. Thus, recalling that $e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) \leq \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2} \,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})$, the entire right-hand side in (129) is monotonically decreasing in k_Y. Hence, because $k_Y > k$, we can further upper-bound (129) as

$$\int_{A^k} e^{-s\rho_2(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}),Y)} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \leq \bigg(e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(A) + k\Big(- e^{-sc^2}\mathscr{L}^d(U_c) + \int_{U_c} e^{-s\|\boldsymbol{x}\|^2} \,\mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^d(\boldsymbol{x})\Big)\bigg)^k$$

which is (126). ∎

APPENDIX H
PROOF OF THEOREM 19

We will use Theorem 10 with random vectors $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ that are given by the probability measure

$$P_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(A_1 \times A_2) \triangleq \int_{A_1} \int_{A_2} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$

for $A_1, A_2 \subseteq (\mathbb{R}^d)^k$. The marginal $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ is distributed according to the probability measure

$$P_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}}(A_1) = P_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)},\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(A_1 \times (\mathbb{R}^d)^k)$$
$$= \int_{A_1} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$
$$\overset{(71)}{=} \int_{A_1} \bigg(\prod_{i=1}^{k} g_{\mathsf{X}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \bigg) \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$

$$\overset{(65)}{=} P_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}(A_1)\,.$$

Thus, $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ has the same distribution as $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$ and, hence, $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)})$ has the same distribution as $\phi_k(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)})$. The assumption (72) is a specialization of (37) for the case of a Poisson PP, USOSPA distortion, and the vectors $(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}, \mathbf{y}^{(k)})$ constructed above. Therefore, all assumptions in Theorem 10 are satisfied and we obtain (cf. (38))

$$R(D) \leq H(|\mathsf{X}|) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k)\, I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big)\,. \tag{130}$$

Because $|\mathsf{X}|$ is given by a Poisson distribution, we have $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) = \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} H(|\mathsf{X}|) &= -\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log\left(\frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\right) \\ &= \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\big(-\log e^{-\nu} - \log \nu^k + \log k!\big) \\ &= \nu \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}_0} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} - \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k k}{k!} \log \nu + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log k! \\ &= \nu - \nu \log \nu + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log k!\,. \end{aligned} \tag{131}$$

To derive the mutual informations $I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big)$, we first note that $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ is a continuous random vector and the same holds for $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ conditioned on $\mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}$. Thus, according to [4, eq. (8.48)], we can calculate the mutual information as

$$\begin{aligned} I\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}; \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big) &= h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) - \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}\big)\, \mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \\ &= k\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) + \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \\ &\qquad \times \log g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\, \mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\,. \end{aligned} \tag{132}$$

Here, we used $h(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}) = h(\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}) = k\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}})$, which holds because of (65) and because $\mathbf{x}^{(k)}$ has the same distribution as $\mathbf{x}_{\mathsf{X}}^{(k)}$. Inserting (131), $p_{|\mathsf{X}|}(k) = \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}$, and (132) into (130) gives

$$\begin{aligned} R(D) &\leq \nu - \nu \log \nu + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log k! + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \Bigg(k\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) \\ &\quad + \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\, \log g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\, \mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \Bigg) \\ &= \nu - \nu \log \nu + \nu\, h(g_{\mathsf{X}}) + \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \Bigg(\log k! \\ &\quad + \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^d)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\, \log g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})\, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^d)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\, \mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \Bigg) \end{aligned}$$

which is (74).

APPENDIX I
LEMMATA FOR EXAMPLE 20

We consider the setting of Example 20, i.e., X is a Poisson PP on $\mathbb{R}^2$ with intensity measure $\lambda = \nu\mathscr{L}^2|_{[0,1)^2}$. Furthermore, $N \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfies $N \geq 1/(\sqrt{2}c)$, λ_{Y} is defined by (78), and $g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k})$ is defined by (79).

Lemma 26: Equation (77) is satisfied, i.e.,

$$\int_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{[0,1)^2}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\,.$$

Proof: Based on (78) and (79), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^k} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}^k(\boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \\
&\qquad = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\cdots\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} g_{\mathbf{x}^{(k)}|\mathbf{y}^{(k)}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k} \,|\, \boldsymbol{y}_{1:k}) \,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{y}_k)\cdots\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{y}_2)\,\mathrm{d}\lambda_{\mathsf{Y}}(\boldsymbol{y}_1) \\
&\qquad = \left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)^k \sum_{j_1^{(1)}=1}^{N}\sum_{j_2^{(1)}=1}^{N}\sum_{j_1^{(2)}=1}^{N}\sum_{j_2^{(2)}=1}^{N}\cdots\sum_{j_1^{(k)}=1}^{N}\sum_{j_2^{(k)}=1}^{N} \frac{1}{k!}\sum_{\tau}\prod_{i=1}^{k} N^2 \mathbb{1}_{Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{k!}\sum_{\tau}\prod_{i=1}^{k}\left(\sum_{j_1^{(i)}=1}^{N}\sum_{j_2^{(i)}=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right) \\
&\qquad = \frac{1}{k!}\sum_{\tau}\prod_{i=1}^{k}\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{N}\sum_{j_2=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{Q_{j_1,j_2}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right) \\
&\qquad = \prod_{i=1}^{k}\left(\sum_{j_1=1}^{N}\sum_{j_2=1}^{N} \mathbb{1}_{Q_{j_1,j_2}}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)\right) \\
&\qquad \overset{(a)}{=} \prod_{i=1}^{k} \mathbb{1}_{[0,1)^2}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)
\end{aligned}$$

where we used in (a) that $\{Q_{j_1,j_2}\}_{j_1,j_2=1,\ldots,N}$ is a partition of $[0,1)^2$. ■

Lemma 27: Equation (81) holds, i.e.,

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big] = \frac{\nu}{6N^2}\,. \tag{133}$$

Proof: Using (78) and (80), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big]$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \int_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^k} \left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)^k \sum_{j_1^{(1)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(1)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_1^{(2)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(2)}=1}^{N} \cdots \sum_{j_1^{(k)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(k)}=1}^{N} \frac{N^{2k}}{k!} \Big(\sum_{\tau} \mathbb{1}_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))}, j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \Big) \\
&\quad \times \rho_2\big(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}), \phi_k\big(\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(1)}, j_2^{(1)}}, \dots, \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(k)}, j_2^{(k)}}\big)\big)\big) \, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&= \sum_{j_1^{(1)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(1)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_1^{(2)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(2)}=1}^{N} \cdots \sum_{j_1^{(k)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(k)}=1}^{N} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\tau} \int_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^k} \mathbb{1}_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))}, j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&\quad \times \rho_2\big(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}), \phi_k\big(\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(1)}, j_2^{(1)}}, \dots, \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(k)}, j_2^{(k)}}\big)\big)\big) \, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \,. \qquad (134)
\end{aligned}
$$

The integrals in this sum can be rewritten as

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))}, j_2^{(\tau(i))}}} \rho_2\big(\phi_k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}), \phi_k\big(\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(1)}, j_2^{(1)}}, \dots, \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(k)}, j_2^{(k)}}\big)\big)\big) \, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&\quad \overset{(a)}{=} \int_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))}, j_2^{(\tau(i))}}} \min_{\tau'} \sum_{i'=1}^{k} \min\big\{ \big\| \boldsymbol{x}_{i'} - \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(\tau'(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau'(i'))}} \big\|^2, c^2 \big\} \, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&\quad \overset{(b)}{=} \int_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))}, j_2^{(\tau(i))}}} \sum_{i'=1}^{k} \min\big\{ \big\| \boldsymbol{x}_{i'} - \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(\tau(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau(i'))}} \big\|^2, c^2 \big\} \, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&\quad = \sum_{i'=1}^{k} \int_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))}, j_2^{(\tau(i))}}} \min\big\{ \big\| \boldsymbol{x}_{i'} - \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(\tau(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau(i'))}} \big\|^2, c^2 \big\} \, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\
&\quad = \sum_{i'=1}^{k} \int_{\prod\limits_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i'}}^{k} Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))}, j_2^{(\tau(i))}}} 1 \, \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^{k-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_{i'-1}, \boldsymbol{x}_{i'+1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{x}_k) \\
&\qquad \times \int_{Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau(i'))}}} \min\big\{ \big\| \boldsymbol{x}_{i'} - \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(\tau(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau(i'))}} \big\|^2, c^2 \big\} \, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^2(\boldsymbol{x}_{i'}) \\
&\quad = \sum_{i'=1}^{k} \left(\prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq i'}}^{k} \mathscr{L}^2\big(Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))}, j_2^{(\tau(i))}}\big) \right) \int_{Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau(i'))}}} \min\big\{ \big\| \boldsymbol{x}_{i'} - \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(\tau(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau(i'))}} \big\|^2, c^2 \big\} \, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^2(\boldsymbol{x}_{i'}) \\
&\quad = \left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)^{k-1} \sum_{i'=1}^{k} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2N}, \frac{1}{2N})^2} \min\big\{ \|\boldsymbol{x}_{i'}\|^2, c^2 \big\} \, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^2(\boldsymbol{x}_{i'}) \\
&\quad \overset{(c)}{=} \frac{1}{N^{2(k-1)}} \sum_{i'=1}^{k} \int_{[-\frac{1}{2N}, \frac{1}{2N})^2} \|\boldsymbol{x}_{i'}\|^2 \, \mathrm{d}\mathscr{L}^2(\boldsymbol{x}_{i'}) \\
&\quad = \frac{1}{N^{2(k-1)}} \frac{k}{6N^4} \\
&\quad = \frac{k}{6N^{2(k+1)}} \qquad (135)
\end{aligned}
$$

where (a) is due to (66) (with $k_{\mathsf{X}} = k_{\mathsf{Y}} = k$), (b) holds because for $\boldsymbol{x}_{i'} \in Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau(i'))}}$, the closest $\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1, j_2}$ for $j_1, j_2 \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ is $\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(\tau(i'))}, j_2^{(\tau(i'))}}$ and thus $\tau' = \tau$ is the minimizing permutation, and (c)

holds because $\|\boldsymbol{x}_{i'}\|^2 \leq 1/(2N^2) \leq c^2$ for $\boldsymbol{x}_{i'} \in \big[-\frac{1}{2N}, \frac{1}{2N}\big)^2$ (recall our assumption $N \geq 1/(\sqrt{2}c)$). Inserting (135) into (134), we obtain

$$\mathbb{E}\big[\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big] = \sum_{j_1^{(1)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(1)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_1^{(2)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(2)}=1}^{N} \cdots \sum_{j_1^{(k)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(k)}=1}^{N} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\tau} \frac{k}{6N^{2(k+1)}} = \frac{k}{6N^2} \tag{136}$$

and inserting (136) into the left-hand side of (133) yields

$$\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \mathbb{E}\big[\rho_2\big(\phi_k(\mathbf{x}^{(k)}), \phi_k(\mathbf{y}^{(k)})\big)\big] = \frac{1}{6N^2} \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} k = \frac{\nu}{6N^2}\,.$$

■

Lemma 28: Equation (83) holds, i.e.,

$$h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big) \geq \frac{\binom{N^2}{k} k!}{N^{2k}} \log k! - k \log N^2\,.$$

Proof: We obtain from (75) and (78)

$$h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big) = \left(\frac{1}{N^2}\right)^k \sum_{j_1^{(1)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(1)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_1^{(2)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(2)}=1}^{N} \cdots \sum_{j_1^{(k)}=1}^{N} \sum_{j_2^{(k)}=1}^{N} h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \big(\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(1)},j_2^{(1)}}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(k)},j_2^{(k)}}\big)\big) \tag{137}$$

where, by (76) and (80),

$$\begin{aligned} h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \big(\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(1)},j_2^{(1)}}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(k)},j_2^{(k)}}\big)\big) = &- \int_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^k} \left(\frac{N^{2k}}{k!} \sum_{\tau} \mathbb{1}_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\right) \\ &\times \log\left(\frac{N^{2k}}{k!} \sum_{\tau} \mathbb{1}_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\right) \mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\,. \end{aligned} \tag{138}$$

We distinguish two cases: If the indices $j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}$ are such that $\big(j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}\big) \neq \big(j_1^{(i')}, j_2^{(i')}\big)$ for all $i \neq i'$, then the sets $Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}$ are all disjoint. This implies that the Cartesian products $\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}$ are disjoint for different permutations τ and hence the probability density function in the differential entropy in (138) simplifies to

$$\frac{N^{2k}}{k!} \sum_{\tau} \mathbb{1}_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) = \frac{N^{2k}}{k!} \mathbb{1}_{\bigcup_\tau \prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})$$

i.e., the probability density function of a uniform distribution on $\bigcup_\tau \prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}$. Because a uniform distribution on a Borel set $A \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ has differential entropy $\log(\mathscr{L}^d(A))$ (see [4, eq. (8.2)]), the differential entropy in (138) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \big(\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(1)},j_2^{(1)}}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(k)},j_2^{(k)}}\big)\big) &= \log\left((\mathscr{L}^2)^k\left(\bigcup_\tau \prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}\right)\right) \\ &= \log\left(\sum_\tau (\mathscr{L}^2)^k\left(\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}\right)\right) \end{aligned}$$

$$= \log\left(\sum_{\tau} \frac{1}{N^{2k}}\right)$$
$$= \log\left(\frac{k!}{N^{2k}}\right). \tag{139}$$

On the other hand, if there exist indices $\big(j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}\big) = \big(j_1^{(i')}, j_2^{(i')}\big)$ for some $i \neq i'$, we can still bound the differential entropy in (138). In fact, we can trivially upper-bound the corresponding probability density function in (80) by N^{2k}. Using this bound in the argument of the logarithm in (138), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)} = \big(\boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(1)},j_2^{(1)}}, \ldots, \boldsymbol{q}_{j_1^{(k)},j_2^{(k)}}\big)\big) & \\ &\geq -\int_{(\mathbb{R}^2)^k} \left(\frac{N^{2k}}{k!} \sum_{\tau} \mathbb{1}_{\prod_{i=1}^k Q_{j_1^{(\tau(i))},j_2^{(\tau(i))}}}(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k})\right) \log N^{2k} \,\mathrm{d}(\mathscr{L}^2)^k(\boldsymbol{x}_{1:k}) \\ &= -\log N^{2k}\,. \end{aligned} \tag{140}$$

Inserting for all $\big(j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}\big)$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ either (139) or (140) into (137) (depending on whether the $\big(j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}\big)$ are pairwise distinct or not), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h\big(\mathbf{x}^{(k)} \,\big|\, \mathbf{y}^{(k)}\big) &\overset{(a)}{\geq} \frac{1}{N^{2k}}\left(\binom{N^2}{k} k! \log\left(\frac{k!}{N^{2k}}\right) - \left(N^{2k} - \binom{N^2}{k} k!\right) \log N^{2k}\right) \\ &= \frac{1}{N^{2k}}\left(\binom{N^2}{k} k! \log k! - \binom{N^2}{k} k! \log N^{2k} - N^{2k} \log N^{2k} + \binom{N^2}{k} k! \log N^{2k}\right) \\ &= \frac{\binom{N^2}{k} k!}{N^{2k}} \log k! - k \log N^2 \end{aligned} \tag{141}$$

where we used in (a) that there are $\binom{N^2}{k} k!$ possible choices of pairwise distinct $\big(j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}\big)$ and, hence, $N^{2k} - \binom{N^2}{k} k!$ possible choices of $\big\{\big(j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}\big)\big\}_{i=1,\ldots,k}$ where there exist indices $\big(j_1^{(i)}, j_2^{(i)}\big) = \big(j_1^{(i')}, j_2^{(i')}\big)$ for some $i \neq i'$. ∎

Lemma 29: For $\widetilde{N} \in \mathbb{N}$ with $\widetilde{N} \leq N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\big(\log k! + k \log N^2\big) - \sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}^2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k \binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}} \log k! \\ &\qquad \leq \nu \log N^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}^2} e^{-\nu}\nu^k \log k! \left(\frac{1}{k!} - \frac{\binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}}\right) + \left(1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\widetilde{N}^2-2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\right)\nu^2\,. \end{aligned} \tag{142}$$

Proof: We have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!}\big(\log k! + k \log N^2\big) - \sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}^2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k \binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}} \log k! \\ &\qquad = \sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} k \log N^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}^2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log k! + \sum_{k=\widetilde{N}^2+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log k! - \sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}^2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k \binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}} \log k! \end{aligned}$$

$$\stackrel{(a)}{=} \nu \log N^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{\widetilde{N}^2} e^{-\nu}\nu^k \log k! \left(\frac{1}{k!} - \frac{\binom{N^2}{k}}{N^{2k}} \right) + \sum_{k=\widetilde{N}^2+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log k! \tag{143}$$

where (a) holds because $\sum_{k\in\mathbb{N}} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} k = \nu$. The infinite sum on the right-hand side of (143) can be bounded by

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=\widetilde{N}^2+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \log k! &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{k=\widetilde{N}^2+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{(k-1)!} \log k \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{k=\widetilde{N}^2+1}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{(k-2)!} \\
&= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^{k+2}}{k!} - \sum_{k=0}^{\widetilde{N}^2-2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^{k+2}}{k!} \\
&= \left(1 - \sum_{k=0}^{\widetilde{N}^2-2} \frac{e^{-\nu}\nu^k}{k!} \right) \nu^2
\end{aligned} \tag{144}$$

where (a) holds because $\log k! \leq k \log k$ and (b) holds because $\log k \leq k-1$. Inserting (144) into (143), we obtain (142). ■

REFERENCES

[1] M. Chen, S. Mao, and Y. Liu, "Big data: A survey," *Mobile Networks and Applications*, vol. 19, no. 2, pp. 171–209, Apr. 2014. [Online]. Available: http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11036-013-0489-0

[2] D. J. Daley and D. Vere-Jones, *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes; Volume I: Elementary Theory and Methods*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Springer, 2003.

[3] ——, *An Introduction to the Theory of Point Processes; Volume II: General Theory and Structure*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Springer, 2008.

[4] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*, 2nd ed. New York, NY: Wiley, 2006.

[5] F. Baccelli and J. O. Woo, "On the entropy and mutual information of point processes," in *Proc. IEEE Int. Symp. Inf. Theory (ISIT 2016)*, Barcelona, Spain, Jul. 2016, pp. 695–699.

[6] I. Rubin, "Information rates and data-compression schemes for Poisson processes," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 200–210, Mar. 1974.

[7] R. G. Gallager, "Basic limits on protocol information in data communication networks," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 385–398, Jul. 1976.

[8] S. Verdú, "The exponential distribution in information theory," *Probl. Inf. Transmiss.*, vol. 32, no. 1, pp. 86–95, 1996.

[9] H. Sato and T. Kawabata, "Information rates for Poisson point processes," *Trans. IEICE*, vol. E70, no. 9, pp. 817–822, Sep. 1987.

[10] L. R. Varshney and V. K. Goyal, "Benefiting from disorder: Source coding for unordered data," *arXiv:0708.2310 [cs.IT]*, pp. 1–35, 2007.

[11] A. Lapidoth, A. Malär, and L. Wang, "Covering point patterns," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 61, no. 9, pp. 4521–4533, Sep. 2015.

[12] D. Schuhmacher, B. T. Vo, and B. N. Vo, "A consistent metric for performance evaluation of multi-object filters," *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.*, vol. 56, no. 8, pp. 3447–3457, Aug 2008.

[13] T. Berger, *Rate Distortion Theory*, ser. Information and System Sciences Series, T. Kailath, Ed. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1971.

[14] Y. Linde, A. Buzo, and R. M. Gray, "An algorithm for vector quantizer design," *IEEE Trans. Commun.*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 84–95, Jan. 1980.

[15] I. Csiszár, "On an extremum problem of information theory," *Stud. Sci. Math. Hung.*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 57–71, 1974.

[16] R. M. Gray, *Source Coding Theory*. Boston, MA: Kluwer, 1990.

[17] R. M. Gray, *Entropy and Information Theory*. New York, NY: Springer, 1990.

[18] S. Kullback, *Information Theory and Statistics*. New York, NY: Wiley, 1978.

[19] S. Lloyd, "Least squares quantization in PCM," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 28, no. 2, pp. 129–137, Mar. 1982.

[20] M. Emelianenko, L. Ju, and A. Rand, "Nondegeneracy and weak global convergence of the Lloyd algorithm in $\mathbb{R}^d$," *SIAM J. Numer. Anal.*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 1423–1441, 2008.

[21] A. W. van der Vaart, *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[22] T. Kawabata and A. Dembo, "The rate-distortion dimension of sets and measures," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 40, no. 5, pp. 1564–1572, Sep. 1994.

[23] T. Koch, "The Shannon lower bound is asymptotically tight," *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, vol. 62, no. 11, pp. 6155–6161, Nov. 2016.

[24] H.-J. Bandelt, Y. Crama, and F. C. R. Spieksma, "Approximation algorithms for multi-dimensional assignment problems with decomposable costs," *Discrete Appl. Math.*, vol. 49, pp. 25–50, 1994.

[25] H.-J. Bandelt, A. Maas, and F. C. R. Spieksma, "Local search heuristics for multi-index assignment problems with decomposable costs," *J. Oper. Res. Soc.*, vol. 55, no. 7, pp. 694–704, Jul. 2004.

[26] Y. Kuroki and T. Matsui, "An approximation algorithm for multidimensional assignment problems minimizing the sum of squared errors," *Discrete Appl. Math.*, vol. 157, pp. 2124–2135, 2009.

[27] M. Baum, B. Balasingam, P. Willett, and U. D. Hanebeck, "OSPA barycenters for clustering set-valued data," in *Intl. Conf. on Inf. Fusion*, Jul. 2015, pp. 1375–1381.

[28] J. Illian, A. Penttinen, H. Stoyan, and D. Stoyan, *Statistical Analysis and Modelling of Spatial Point Patterns*. Chichester, UK: Wiley, 2008.

[29] J. Møller and R. P. Waagepetersen, *Statistical Inference and Simulation for Spatial Point Processes*. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2004.